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Reviewer’s report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

In the definition box use the following order: systematic review, meta-analysis, and HTA.

In the first paragraph of the discussion the authors state "our study shows that compliance in a sample of recent systematic reviews was moderate". Hardly moderate at 49% - getting to the play of chance percent in my view, particularly so in that the 'sub analyses' show even less adequate reporting. Consider a term other than 'moderate'.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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