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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript has improved after amendments, but there are still some minor changes needed before publication.

Minor Essential Revisions
Page 3 para 2 line 7, page 3 para 3 line 5, page 4 para 3 line 2: You have deleted the old reference no. 2 (Shea J Rheumatol 2006), but you should reference it here as your new reference (Haynes ACP Journal Club 1993) does not cover this information. It should only be used for reference on page 2 para 1 line 4.

Page 4 para 3 line 4: You should not use reference 14 here, but instead reference 13. Secondly your previous reference was no. 12 so this should be no. 13. You should number your references chronologically.

Page 5 para 4 line 5: You did not address my previous question regarding the choice of cut-off date for stratification into pre- and post-QUOROM. In your previous version of the manuscript you choose December 30th 2000, but in the current version it seems you have used the original publication date of the QUOROM statement (November 27th 1999). Please explain which date is the correct date used for your stratified analysis. Secondly you should explain your choice of cut-off in the manuscript.

Page 9 para 1 line 6: You write “The included reviews failed (26%)…”, but this number is confusing. 26% is the number that avoided selection bias so you should either write that 26% avoided it or that 74% failed to explicitly address it.

Page 11 para 2 line 3: You mention the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group, but you are not giving a reference. I assume you mean the Shea paper (J Rheumatol 2006). Additionally you should delete the reference to the Haynes paper (ACP Journal Club 1993) in line 6.

Page 11 para 3 line 5: You did not address my previous question regarding your statement on lack of published guidelines for the OQAQ. I therefore repeat it.
You state “hence these instruments were not subjected to extensive validation and lack published guidance for their application. But there is a published set of instructions, though it could be more extensive (Jadad AR, McQuay HJ.

Discretionary Revisions

Page 1 para 2 line 5-6: You have included the comparison between pre- and post-publication of QUOROM statement in the methods of the abstract as suggested, but not in the results section of the abstract. You should either report it both in the methods and results or refrain from reporting it in the abstract.

Page 4 para 1 line 2: You should delete the “of” here.

Page 4 para 2 line 6: You should include the reference number in brackets on both sides.

Page 7 para 1 line 6: You should write the manuscript consistently in the same style, so here you should use past tense (i.e. were).

Page 9 para 2 line 2: You should be consistent in the way you report the CI’s (e.g. in brackets as in the paragraph below).

Page 11 para 2 line 5-6: In the sentence "...appear to have a high methodological quality and frequently updated" I would include an "are" before "frequently".

Page 13-15: You should delete the full stop after the question mark in reference 1 and 2 and include a full stop after the page numbers for reference 2.
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