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Reviewer's report:

A clearly written article which demonstrates the challenges related with search (boolean vs ranked) for systematic reviews. I enjoyed reading it.

I have only a few minor comments:

p. 11/ the creation of systematic reviews typically includes synthesis (T2). This process goes beyond the identification of documents meeting the inclusion criteria. It was not clear if T2 is the last process of the search aspect of systematic reviewing or not.

A related project to the one reported here is the ASSERT project (http://www.nactem.ac.uk/assert/). In this work, terms have been used as metadata. It would be useful to look into this work and compare the approaches.

Reference "Supporting systematic reviews using text mining" by S. Ananiadou, B. Rea, R. Procter and J. Thomas (2009) Social Science Computer Review

Other useful references:
Journal of emi-automated screening of biomedical citations for systematic reviews clinical epidemiology, 62.

2. Byron C Wallace, Thomas A Trikalinos, Joseph Lau, Carla Brodley and Christopher H Schmid
http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2105/11/55

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests'