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Reviewer's report:

Maticic et al., have performed an interesting empirical study on assessment of reporting quality of abstracts of systematic reviews in anesthesiology using PRISMA-A. In addition, they estimated discordance in assessments between raters without prior experience. The authors have indeed a profound knowledge on assessing the reporting of study quality and are very familiar with the EQUATOR list of instruments that support this process. However, I am a little hesitant as to the message that this paper may convey. Specifically, it is based on abstracts of published systematic reviews and meta-analyses in fulltext in peer-reviewed journals. This implies that the reviewers of the manuscripts have already performed a quality assessment for these papers. Assuming that several PRISMA A items are missing from the abstracts, the final publication may also reveal an inadequate review process instead of an abstract non-adherent to PRISMA-A. In addition, some of the items may well be addressed in the full text and journal guidelines may not encourage their reporting in the abstract (word count also plays a role to this decision). Such examples include "Strengths and limitations of evidence", "Funding", "Registration number". Finally, the ultimate decision on whether a published systematic review /meta-analysis would be helpful and of high quality to support clinical practice guidelines is made by the assessment of the whole manuscript; not merely by the assessment of the reporting of the abstract. Based on the previous comments, I think that the effort made by the authors does not meet the novelty to be published in a journal with a broad audience. Authors may consider trying to submit their work to a journal on the field of anesthesiology. A comparison with a control group of conference abstracts on the same field may also enhance the conclusion and provide additional guidance.
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