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**General**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)**

1. This article discusses the discrepancy between the conclusions of a meta-analysis and 3 subsequent randomised controlled trials. The overall message is that the results of the meta-analysis may be biased because of publication bias in the trials included therein. This may well be true. However, there are several possible reasons for the discrepancy between the meta-analysis and the subsequent trials, and the author does not consider these at all. The Cochrane systematic review (referred to in the submitted paper) appears to be very fair. It has more cautious conclusions than the meta-analysis, and includes 2 of the 3 trials. It is unclear what the submitted article adds to the Cochrane Review. The author should make it clear what this article adds to knowledge over and above what is already known.

2. The premise of the argument is unsubstantiated (‘A main reason for the controversy seems to be that the results of three recent RCTs are at odds with a meta-analysis that was published earlier’). The author should provide evidence for this statement.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)**

**What next?:** Reject because too small an advance to publish

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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