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Comments to authors (BMC Med Res Meth)

It is an interesting study in which the authors tried to determine the reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analysis in ophthalmology with the PRISMA statement. Similar studies have been reported in different fields like gastroenterology and hepatology journals (PLoS ONE 2013;8: e83138), radiology journals (Radiology 2013;269:413-26), otorhinolaryngology journals (PLoS ONE 2015;10:e0136540) and nursing journals (BMJ Open 2017;7: e013905). Authors may consider to include these studies of other fields in the Introduction section and to compare with their results in Discussion section.

The methodology is quite standard and should be robust. I provide some comments for the authors to improve the manuscript particularly in the methods and results section.

Methods

Can consider to add the reference (or the link) of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, version 5.1.0.

Search methods subsection

Is the name of the fifth journal be "Optometry - Journal of the American Optometric Association" instead of "Journal of American Optometric Association". ?

From the 2014 Journal Citation Report, the top four journals were selected by the authors but the fifth top journal, "Survey of Ophthalmology", was not selected, why?

Also, why ""Journal of the American Optometric Association" was selected given its impact factor was 0.833. Please clarify.

This sentence "Articles were sorted by applying predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria to the title and abstracts" is not clear. How to sort according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria?
What does this sentence "Minimum set of methodological characteristics were not required" mean?

It seems that the structure of this sentence is not correct "Any nonsystematic and non-meta-analysis studies were excluded, which involved narrative reviews, expert reviews and randomised controlled trials."

Scoring subsection

Please elaborate this "Elements that were not applicable to the article were excluded to eliminate their effect on the item score". Does it mean that if the Systematic Review did not include any meta-analysis, then those items related to meta-analysis would be excluded?

Did the authors compute the total score of the 27 items for each systematic review?

Statistical Analysis subsection

"Cohen's Kappa statistic was used to calculate the inter-observer correlation" Kappa between who? The two reviewers in the scoring or what?

Results section

Please check whether these 5 journals required / recommended the authors to follow PRISMA checklist in writing their systematic reviews. It is a critical factor about the adherence of PRISMA

Figure 1, the last box should be "Studies included in analysis"? You did not conduct meta-analysis

Table 1 Item 2, whether there was structure abstract would depend on the journal requirement?

Table 1, you may consider to add one row at the end to summarize the overall adherence not only by individual item.

Figure 2 the label of the axis mis-spelled "Articles" as "Ariticles" but would it be better to change it as "Compliance % to PRISMA"?

Figure 2 whether the trend is statistically significant or not?
Discussion section

I think the discussion can be elaborated in more details. For example, the authors can pick those items with compliance<30% (i.e. item 4, 5, 15, 16 & 23) for a more comprehensive discussion. At stated in the beginning, several studies were conducted in recent years and they all presented tables to show the compliance of each items, so the authors can consider to make contrast to those results.

**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.

Yes

**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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