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Reviewer's report:

Excellent research to back the general position that systematic reviews be based only RCTs when RCTs of sufficient quality are available.

Major: Need to discuss the major limitation that we do not know whether the differences in categorization of the RCT (and non-RCT) studies reflects a) irreconcilable differences of opinions between the authors of the different reviews or b) differences of interpretation of criteria that could be resolved by discussion and consensus. I suspect it would be a combination of both.

This could be the subject of future research as well as seeing how much consensus depends on communication methods -- my hypothesis is that there would be a communication method consensus producing gradient (in person > video conferencing > telephone > email) but who knows.

Robert Dellavalle, MD, PhD, MSPH
University of Colorado Denver School of Medicine

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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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