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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Page 5/para 2
Add in the word “potential” so that the phrase reads “…illustrate the potential effectiveness of these new filters”.

Page 9/top paragraph
This section on proof of concept searches is vastly improved but still difficult to follow. How many clinical questions did you ask? Was there only one per systematic review? Which questions were matched to which reviews? This needs to be explicit, rather than implicit, to help the reader.

Suggest the sentence “we formulated clinical questions to reflect recent systematic reviews” be changed to something like “We formulated six clinical questions, each which could be answered by a corresponding recent systematic review. For example, “Does corticosteroid ameliorate …renal injury” was framed to match a systematic review of the effects of corticosteroids ….”.

It would also help to refer to the Table at this stage in the manuscript, and within the table, to cite the relevant reviews alongside the relevant question.

Discretionary Changes

Page 4/Background/Paragraph 2
In response to my criticism (and that of the other reviewer) that this research should be placed in the context of other filter research, the barest minimal changes in this regard. The authors have relied on including a new reference 5 (Intertasc Search filter resource) as redressing this concern. In fact, this still fails to acknowledge the intellectual contribution of others as it is a clearinghouse of a large number of filters. If this truly were sufficient from an academic perspective, then given their own work is referenced within the Intertasc resource, it shouldn’t be necessary to reference such a large number of their own papers. So whilst I have accepted this minimal change as sufficient, I do encourage the authors to consider the scholarship of their approach.
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