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Reviewer’s report:

Authors evaluated the quality of reporting of procedures related to the use of stents for PCI trials, and the overall quality of reporting these trials.

Major comments:
1. the selection process was performed by one author, a strategy which is not standard and may lead to have a biased group of trials.
2. the data extraction was performed mainly by one author and partially by a second author. It is unclear if they agreed or not, and how much. It is also necessary to provide the data extraction form.
3. there is a clear overlap of the guidelines of trial reporting (CONSORT vs. CLEAR-NPT), but authors did not specify which are common or different items.
4. This analysis is based on trials published until dec 2005, a long time ago.
5. there are two general pieces of information that should be shown and commented: quality of reporting of specific procedures, and overall quality of reporting trials as per CONSORT. This should be clarified in title and abstract.
6. quality of reporting procedures cannot be satisfactory probably because these details were previously published in separated manuscripts. did authors check this?

Minor points:
1. Please include reporting and quality as keywords
2. Some information given in the results section is also shown in Tables. Please restrict to one of them.
3. a very recent paper (Lim et al. Ann Intern Med 2008; 149: 612-7) can be referenced in support of the statement on the discussion section (page 10, last paragraph), regarding problems with composite outcomes.
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