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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised paper. The authors have responded more than adequately to allow this manuscript to be published. I only have one minor essential revision to suggest which includes providing captions/labels to the figures provided (including labelling of x and y axes so it’s clear to the reader what is being presented).

In addition, I am mentioning a few discretionary revisions:

1) In the abstract – conclusions section....‘and 60% (stated) databases had been searched.’ Added in the word ‘stated’. This phrase was awkward to read.

2) When screening for systematic reviews – what criteria were used to determine their eligibility? If a more loose definition was used vs. a more stringent definition (i.e., Cochrane’s criteria) etc. this may have also impacted your findings. Having been through this exercise, classifying a non-Cochrane review as systematic isn’t always straightforward.

3) In relation to non-Cochrane – is there certainty that amid the CCJ sample – none were co-publications of Cochrane Reviews published in the CCJ journals? (just a thought as this could be possible)

Thank you
Chantelle Garritty

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.
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