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Reviewer's report:

The authors evaluated compliance of 97 systematic reviews in ophthalmology with the PRISMA Statement. The methods used in this study are sound and the results are interpreted appropriately. However, there is not enough justification for why this study is needed. The authors fail to discuss the results of a recent cross-sectional analysis of 300 systematic reviews of biomedical research (regardless of specialty), which already provides extensive data on the poor reporting quality of systematic reviews (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27218655).

The decision to focus on systematic reviews in ophthalmology is explained as follows in the Background: "Studies in ophthalmology may present further challenges for researchers and readers, due to the need for complex study design. For example, the presence of two potential data points of each patient (i.e. two eyes) may require alternative designs and methods of analysis, hence the result and the conclusions of such studies may be confusing without appropriate explanations. Systematic reviews have a role in enabling accurate appraisal of the literature by interpreting large pool of data that could resolve such complexity, and it is paramount for them to provide complete, clear and transparent information via good reporting." While this is all true, I fail to see how the PRISMA statement would be able to pick up these specific complexities of analysis in ophthalmology reviews, given that it is designed for generic use. And given such complexities in ophthalmology reviews are already known, why were they not assessed in this sample?

The authors state that "Articles were included if they were published between January 2010 and December 2015, and were systematic reviews and/or meta-analysis, i.e. studies that collects and critically analyses multiple researches". This definition of systematic reviews is very broad, and seems to permit inclusion of narrative (non-systematic) reviews. Also I don't know what "multiple researches" means.

The trend for improvement in Figure 3 is barely perceptible. I suspect that if 95% confidence intervals were placed on each bar, they would overlap (indicating no significant difference between years).

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