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Reviewer's report:

I would ask the authors to consider expanding just a bit on their use of Doctors Evidence as a second, independent search. This is something I have not seen before in any protocol or published study, and I am curious about the motivation to do this and what the authors will make of the results. I suspect readers of the Journal may be similarly curious. Why have the independent search? What is it about their first search - which looks pretty standard - is felt to be insufficient to warrant a separate search? What will they do with articles identified by one search strategy and not by the other? do they plan some kind of comparative analysis?

Secondly, I think the authors probably know this, but their plans for meta-regression are probably optimistic. They write that they plan to do meta-regression with "multiple study level covariates" when there are 'at least 10 studies in a meta-analysis". I am not a statistician, but the one who participates with our review group says that the rule of thumb here is 10 studies for each degree of freedom. So with 10 studies, if they had nothing other than the overall pooled effect, they might have room for one covariate. to do "multiple", implying at least 2, they'd need 20 studies minimum, and probably a lot more.