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**Author’s response to reviews:**

**Editor Comments:**

While you have responded most of the reviewers’ comments, I find a few remnant issues that need to be addressed to ensure your narrative is clear and accurate.

1. Table 3 - add citation to included studies counted for each item in the first column.

Response: We have added citations accordingly in Table 3.

2. Do the data from the three studies in Table 4 permit a meta-analysis? Why not? What were the reported estimates for association between inconsistency and time to publication? P-values are mentioned in Table 4 but not estimates.

Response: We have added the point estimate for Bhandari’s study. However no estimate was reported in Snedeker’s study; therefore no data could be extracted or provided in Table 4.

We decided not to run the pooled analyses for the associations between factors and inconsistencies, mainly because of the heterogeneity of studies. For example, the three studies in Table 4 focused on various biomedical areas (orthopedics, infectious diseases and microbiology, veterinary pre-harvest or abattoir-level interventions against foodborne pathogens), and they used different measures of inconsistencies (minor and major difference in all study aspects between abstracts and full reports for Bhandari’s and Rosmarakis’s studies vs difference in the numbers of outcomes for Snedeker’s study). Moreover, the number of studies included in Table 4 was very small (n = 3), and one study did not report the point estimate for the association between time to publication and an inconsistency. Therefore we did not perform a meta-analysis here. Thanks.

3. Introduction - the second sentence is distracting here. I would move it out of here to the Methods. The distinction between abstracts within full reports and conference abstracts is more relevant in the context of your audience understanding what you did, i.e., your Methods. A
Surveys and systematic reviews were considered eligible if they compared abstracts within full reports with the reports themselves, and that compared conference abstracts with subsequent full reports emanating from the same study. We did not distinguish between these comparisons in this study.

Response: We appreciate the editor’s helpful advice. Changes have been made accordingly (Page 3, Paragraphs 1-2).

4. Delete the last sentence in the Introduction and address it in the Methods as suggested above in #3.
Response: Revision has been made.

5. Methods - second paragraph - did the review have to assess risk of bias in the included studies to be considered "systematic"? This is an important characteristic for a systematic review.
Response: When considering inclusion criteria, we did not evaluate the risk of bias for the potentially eligible systematic reviews. However we used the AMSTAR tool to assess risk of bias for the included systematic reviews (Page 4, Paragraph 4).

6. Methods - Outcome measures - last sentence - is it factors associated with consistent or inconsistent reporting? Table 4 describes factors associated with inconsistent reporting.
Response: We have rectified the description (Page 4, Paragraph 2).

7. Generating the word cloud - clarify whether the input was the number of included studies that used a certain term to describe difference between abstracts and full reports.
Response: We have rephrased the sentence for clarification (Page 5, Paragraph 1).
8. Rephrase "AMSTAR score" to "sum of scores on AMSTAR items" unless "AMSTAR score" is something that has previously been authenticated by authors of AMSTAR.

Response: We have rephrased the terms used (Page 5, Paragraph 3).

9. In the Methods, specify that you computed a score by counting the number of items on AMSTAR that the included studies met.

Response: Changes have been made (Page 4, Paragraph 4).

10. Results - second paragraph - last sentence - not clear.

Response: The sentence has been updated (Page 5, Paragraph 3).

11. Results - fourth paragraph - second sentence - needs editing - not well constructed.

Response: The sentence has been edited (Page 6, Paragraph 1).

12. Discussion - first sentence - what is "the abstract reporting issue in primary biomedical research"? This sentence needs to be better constructed to clearly convey what you mean.

Response: The sentence has been rephrased (Page 6, Paragraph 3).

13. Discussion - first paragraph - last sentence - this is not consistent with your findings - was the association with "improved reporting" or reporting with an inconsistency between abstract and full report?

Response: Change has been made (Page 6, Paragraph 3).
14. Discussion - third paragraph - first sentence - it will suffice to say "spin" instead of "spin problem."
Response: Change has been made.

15. Discussion - fourth paragraph - the first three sentences are not clear. Can you re-write to clearly say what you want to convey?
Response: We have modified the sentences (Page 7, Paragraph 3).

16. Discussion - fourth paragraph - fourth sentence - not well structured.
Response: We have modified the sentence (Page 7, Paragraph 3).

17. Discussion - fifth paragraph - last sentence - not clear.
Response: Sentence has been updated (Page 8, Paragraph 1).

18. Discussion - last paragraph - I don't understand the need to emphasize the strengths of your scoping review. This paragraph needs to be edited to instead discuss limitations in your work.
Response: We have deleted the strengths of our study based on the suggestion (Page 8, Paragraph 3).

19. My previous comment on the title for your work remains - I'm hesitant to consider two papers as a series. The rest of the title seems fine.
Response: We have updated the title (Page 1). Thanks.