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Reviewer's report:

major compulsory revisions
1. you must explain why you have included quasi-RCTs as normally this will not be included unless there is a specific reason. What forms of Quasi-RCT were you willing to include?
2. did you search for unpublished studies?
3. did you include studies in foreign languages?
4. did you check reference lists to find other studies?
5. You MUST put in a flow diagram of the study selection process. How many titles and abstracts did you sift? How many full papers did you examine? What were the reasons for the excluded full papers?
6. What was the quality of the included studies? You say you assessed but how did you use the assessment to indicate the believability of the results?
7. Which studies were the Quasi-RCTs? Did their results differ systematically from the true RCTs?
8. You need to give some details of the patients in the trials. What ages were they? Gender? Ethnicity? etc

minor essential revisions
1. the review needs to be written according to the PRISMA guidelines, including the abstract
2. the abstract conclusions seem to just have more results in. Please move these to the results section and put what you conclude from the systematic review in the conclusions section.
3. p4 the sentence " The treatment of goodpastures ....." in the background section does not make sense to the general reader as you say you are reviewing PRGN then exclude some forms RPGN but don't explain why these are any different from other forms of RPGN and why they should be excluded. - your figure captions don't explain what the forest plots show but seem to be statements of conclusion. Please change them to say exactly what the forest plot is.
4. you don't explain about induction and maintenance agents in the background section yet an understanding of this is expected in the discussion section. Please make the two sections match. For example, exactly what is SCr<500uM???
5. You start to describe cost benefit studies in your implications for research. Do you mean cost-effectiveness as it is very rare to estimate the financial cost of health effects and much more common to estimate utility. Are you actually describing a cost minimisation activity?

discretionary revisions

1. If you were developing a guideline for treatment of this condition, which drug would come first and which next etc? What additional information would you need to be able to construct the guideline (ie which comparative studies are missing?)
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