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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions:

1. This protocol appears to have been registered on PROSPERO. Please include the PROSPERO registration number.

2. A recurrent concern in homeopathy research is the potential for confounding and bias to influence results. The authors state that they will use the Cochrane risk of bias tool which has generic instructions for making judgments for each of the domains. I was wondering if the authors had considered giving a priori statements on how judgments for these domains will be applied in this particular review? e.g. what constitutes sufficient blinding for each form of homeopathy (classical, clinical, complex)?

3. Since the Cochrane risk of bias tool only rates the processes of randomisation and allocation concealment, rather than the outcomes of these processes, the authors may also want to assess the baseline comparability of treatment groups in terms of known prognostic variables.

4. The decision to apply a fixed or random effect(s) model should depend on assumptions about whether the studies represent estimates of the same underlying effect or a distribution of effects, rather than some measure of statistical heterogeneity as currently stated.

5. The authors present a reasonably large number of subgroup and sensitivity analyses. Perhaps they should include a statement that their conclusions will acknowledge the potential for spurious statistical significance.

6. In the file I looked at there were some typographical issues with changes in font size and paragraph spacing, and several instances of missing spaces between words.
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