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Reviewer's report:

The following are all minor essential revisions:

Page 1:
Sophia Tsouros, B. H Kin (add a period after H?)

Page 6:
"The US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) has been a major sponsor of research on updating SRs through its Evidence Based Practice Center program..."
Should be written: Evidence-based Practice Center

Page 8:
Finally, based on: 1) the proportion
ADD space between parenthesis and "the"
"...2) extent of outdatedness global assessment of priority status..."
The second "d" is missing from outdatedness" and this part of the sentence is garbled and maybe missing an additional word?

Page 12:
"In addition, there was a 3 to 17- month lag..."
CHANGE TO:
"In addition, there was a 3- to 17-month lag..."

"..., non- pharmacological procedures [24,28,30],..."
CHANGE TO:
"..., non-pharmacological procedures [24,28,30],..."

Page 13:
"The median number of included studies in the original SRs was 104 (IQR: 71-124)."
CHANGE TO remove extra space after hyphen:
"The median number of included studies in the original SRs was 104 (IQR: 71-124)."
Page 14:
...seven conclusions changed from "up to date" to "possibly out of date", and one conclusion changed from "possibly out of date" to "probably out of date". 
CHANGE placement of comma and period within quotes TO:
...seven conclusions changed from "up to date" to "possibly out of date," and one conclusion changed from "possibly out of date" to "probably out of date."

Page 21:
"RH contributed in1b, 2b, and 3."
CHANGE TO:
"RH contributed in 1b, 2b, and 3."

Page 22 under Acknowledgements:
"... carried out at the Ottawa."
Is this shorthand? Should "the Ottawa" be followed by another word?

The following are discretionary revision suggestions:

Page 3:
"The time lapses for high priority reports were 29 months..."
It would be helpful to clarify what is meant here. I read this as the time lapse for publication of these reports. Is that the correct meaning?

Page 19 regarding future work:
Overall I appreciated the effort and thought that went into this project and paper and it serves a very practical purpose in making the review process more efficient with these findings. The tables and figures all support the text very thoroughly, as well. However, I was left wanting a bit more about directions for future research. How would you suggest making human judgments more reliable across raters? It might be worth summarizing any other lessons learned here, if any. Good work!
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