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Reviewer's report:

The revised protocol now reads more clearly and incorporates the two main requests for clarifications. My other suggestion was to have a statistician to check the consistency of reporting; I notice that the abstract still states that the authors will use a bivariate random effects meta-analysis, yet the more detailed description of the methods (and the planned use of MetaDisc) suggest that they in fact will use separate random effects meta-analyses of sensitivity and sensitivity without accounting for the correlation of these measures.

I don't think MetaDisc 1.4 has the capability to undertake bivariate meta-analysis, so the authors will have to nominate a different package if they plan to use this (preferable) method. On the other hand, if authors plan separate analyses of sensitivity and specificity they will need to justify using this potentially misleading approach (and may have problems publishing the final review; see http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16168343 and http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19208372).

The minor typographical and grammatical issues have been mostly fixed but there are still a few remaining:

Design paragraph: "This trial have" should read "This protocol has"

Statistical analysis section: "rations" should read "ratios"; "SORC" should read "SROC"