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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes. These are interesting questions.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. They are randomly extracted from PubMed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

There may be another related work, which analyzes whether it is possible to identify PICO (or PECODR) elements from abstracts:


8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes. It's overall clearly written.
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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