Reviewer's report

**Title:** Training practitioners in preparing systematic reviews: a cross-sectional survey of participants in the Australasian Cochrane Centre training program

**Authors:**

Janet H Piehl (janet.piehl@med.monash.edu.au)  
Sally Green (sally.green@med.monash.edu.au)  
Chris Silagy (miphchrisspa@med.monash.edu.au)

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 27 May 2002

**Reviewer:** Dr Mike Clarke

**Level of interest:** A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Advice on publication:** Other (see below)

1. I prefer this version to the original. I am pleased with the changes made by the authors.

2. Results, paragraph 5: this should be deleted. It is a repeat of the end of the preceding paragraph.

3. Discussion, paragraph 1, sentence 4: I disagree with this sentence. "Fully funding" a systematic review should not be a pre-requisite of expecting more a reviewer's limited time. I think it would be more correct to say something such as "In the absence of funding for all or, at least, part of a systematic review, it will continue to be difficult for reviewers to do this research by taking more time out of their busy lives."

4. Discussion, paragraph 2, sentence 3: searching by last name and first initial could also underestimate the number of publications. For example, if a person has changed their last name or has a different first initial to the first name they use routinely.

5. Conclusions, paragraph 1, sentence 2: this still refers to "systematic reviews of the literature". Should it not be systematic reviews in general?
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