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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for an interesting and well-written article.

My suggestion will be Accept after minor revision. The foremost reason for why I recommend an Accept, is because SRs and MAs are of high importance in the field of emergency medicine which is quite new in many European countries. Furthermore, there have been studies like yours in other field, expect for emergency medicine.

I am highly impressed by the methodology part of the section. It is well-written and easy to follow.

I have some minor comments:

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.

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?

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.
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 Loberati et al. explanation. Not in details since the reader interested can read the article. But to some extent it should be explained.

Good luck!

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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