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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much. I congratulate the authors for their extensive changes to the manuscript. It reads much better now, although there are still some issues that should be tackled:

- you clarified that there was an a priori developed protocol. Could make it available for reasons of transparency?

- I find your definition of a SR sill a bit too vague. It does not allow for a clear operationalization. For example, you can face meta-analyses without mentioning a literature search. Would that fit your inclusion criteria? What Need also to be more precise what is meant with "reproducible methods". Do the authors Need to Report all or one search strategy(ies) in full?

- delete "We restricted language to English and Chinese" from the method section. This is already mentioned in the sentence before

- was data extraction also performed independently? What happened in case of disagreements?

- your idea of mAMSTAR seems to be very similar to R-AMSTAR

- I think it is more informative to state the 25th and 75th percentile when reporting the IQR instead of calculating the difference of them.

- you elaborated on the (Regression) coefficient. It is was clear this coefficient was from the Regression but it is not entirely clear what it is. I guess it is an Odds Ratio? Please clarify and state how do you Interpret the finding of 0.38
you state in the discussion section now: "The overall methodological quality of SRs on THA was better than that..." Does this only refer to THA? What about TKA?

- ACROBAT-NRSI is already outdated. Please refer to the ROBINS tool (https://sites.google.com/site/riskofbiastool/welcome/home)

- Consider to add two sentences about risk of bias assessment of RCTs in the Quality of Primary studies section as all Reviews included RCTs, but you make a Point for other study designs

- When making the Point that applying mAMSTAR was challenging due to bad reporting, I would like to see some results of this in the manuscript. This could easily be done by referring to table 1 when focusing on the cannot answer category

- What I think is still a Major concern is that you need more to elaborate on the limitations. You modified AMSTAR, while AMSTAR is known to be reliable and valid. I think this statement might not hold true in your case as you made some extensive modifications. Please also note, that the score of AMSTAR has never been validated in any paper. It is mentioned in the external validation paper you are referring to, but it has not undergone any test for validity or reliability. Problems with the scoring are also present in your manuscript as simply summing up scores implies weighting items. However, this weighting is not based any empirical evidence.

Supplement:

Data extraction table: "number of participants in SR" - do you mean number of authors?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
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