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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript improved by using the STARD statement as a reporting guideline instead of using it as methodological quality item scale.

One of the problems in the manuscript is that only 4 studies are reported before the introduction of the STARD statement. So it is probably difficult to make a comparison before and after. However it would be great to see what items are sufficiently addressed by the studies and which ones need improvement. It would also be helpful to know what journals endorse the STARD statements and which ones do not.

Another general remark is the evaluation of anti-ccp in the new criteria. Because they are part of the new criteria simple analysis of Se and Sp is out of the question due to circulation bias. It would be great if the authors could address this issue in the discussion.

In the introduction no references are provided to other fields that did the same exercise (Pre and Post STARD). It would be helpful to discuss this and make the introduction at bit more logically in the one before last paragraph.

On page 7 the last paragraph starts with Study Quality assessment with STARD. This should be rephrased to Evaluation of STARD reporting guideline.

It is not exactly clear from the text on page 8 when a study scores positive. May a description of what items are addressed well and what items need improvement would help to understand this. It would also be good to keep the exact phrasing of the STARD items in table 1.

I am doubting whether you should do a pooled analysis on the median score of the STARD statement. The current analysis still suggests that you use it as an methodological quality instrument rather than a reporting guideline. I understand that you would like to have some feeling of what the impact of poor reporting would be. Are there other ways you could assess the impact of poor reporting?

The heading on page 12 should be “Impact of reporting guidelines..”

The conclusion of the summary is not equal to the conclusion of the manuscript.

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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