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Reviewer's report:

I have now completed my peer review of the revised manuscript. While it is somewhat improved there are several compulsory revisions that the authors need to make.

ï## Some important literature on the topic is missing and needs to be cited:


ï## Page 3, 3rd paragraph. Most RCTs are not phase IV. Such studies are typically post marketing surveillance ones. Without clarification as to how the authors have included what appears to be randomized phase IV trials readers will find this classification confusing and possibly troubling.

ï## The authors need to explain why they chose a sample of 2003 reports â## almost 5 years old.

ï## It appears that the authors did not use â##standardâ## search filters to identify the RCT reports. For example a widely acknowledged and acceptable filter the HSSS one. The authors did to explain why this was not used.

ï## The authors do not report whether the two junior researchers (page 4) received any training and/or participated in a pilot study. This is important as it
appears they did the majority of data extraction (upon which the results are based).

Are the included studies in the research available (at the very least the complete reference list) to interested readers.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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