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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to look again at this revised version of the report. I thank the authors for addressing the issues I raised in my previous feedback. The clarifications have made the report easier to understand. However in some respects the clarifications have not yet reframed the report sufficiently toward a wider audience of Journal readers as opposed to the EPC audience for whom the work was initially completed. I think the work does have an value to a wider audience as the authors clearly reviewed methods/guidance/standards from beyond the EPCS but some of the external focus of the messages for systematic reviewers of effectiveness reviews in the healthcare still could be emphasised more.

One thing that might help is to consider the function of Table 3 which is still phrased as if it is speaking to the EPC audience with numerous cells stating that the existing EPC guidance is satisfactory - as the reader does not know what the EPC guidance actually is (I don't think?) perhaps this table is unnecessary? or perhaps it should just have summaries of 'needs' for further work which I think are identified in the text anyway.

A second step would be to make greater reference to the content of Appendix B in the text of the report. Appendix B has lots of useful information for reviewers but is only mentioned once in the text of the report itself.
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