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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers of BMC Emergency Medicine,

We would like to thank you for considering this manuscript for publication in BMC Emergency Medicine. Furthermore, we would like to thank the reviewers for their feedback and suggestions. We went over all the comments and made changes accordingly. A point-by-point reply to all comment can be found below. We feel it gained more clarity by the adjustments made and hope it is suitable for publication in your journal.

We would be glad to respond to any further questions and comments that you may have.

Kind regards on behalf of all the authors,

Femke Nawijn
Reviewer reports:

Ardavan Khoshnood, MD, PhD, MSc, MA, BSc (Reviewer 1):

1. In regard to the title, I suggest that you change to the following: "Quality of reporting of systematic reviews and meta analyses in emergency medicine, based on the PRISMA statement" or something like this. I believe it is important to state that the study is based on the PRISMA.

We have added “based on the PRISMA statement” to our title to increase accuracy of our title.

2. On line 96, you discuss which characteristics you will find in the reviews. You write among others: "if any of the authors was affiliated with a department of epidemiology or statistics, number of authors". Why are these informations of interest?

A previous study by Adie et al. was unable to find an association between articles with authors affiliated with a department of epidemiology or statistics and the quality of reporting, therefore we wanted to assess this variable as well to confirm or reject this hypothesis for emergency medicine reviews. Furthermore, the number of authors was only used as baseline characteristics to give an overview of how many authors are commonly involved in emergency medicine reviews (Appendix 2). We did not do any additional analyses on this variable.

3. On line 100, you state that the PRISMA statement is consisted by 27 item checklist. I believe that you should already here state how many items each subheading consists of: Title, Introduction, Methodology etc.

We have added the information about how many items the subheadings consist of (line 102 – 104).

4. On line 101-102, you state "The explanation and elaboration by Liberati et al. was used to assess whether an item was reported adequately." You should to some extent describe the Liberati et al. explanation. Not in details since the reader interested can read the article. But to some extent it should be explained.
We have changed this line. The article by Liberati et al. is the official explanation and elaboration formulated by the PRISMA group. Therefore we have added this information in line 104-105.

Jakub Kenig (Reviewer 2):

The theme of suggested publication is very actual and the goal of the suggested publication was to assess the quality of reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analysis in emergency medicine using the PRISMA statement. After the detailed evaluation I think the presented paper is good and I recommend the publication with no correction. However, I must admit, that after reading the title I expected more detailed analysis.

Thank you for your kind comment