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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript analyzes 244 abstracts reporting systematic reviews in anesthesiology for adherence to the PRISMA-A guideline over 2012–2016. The compliance of each abstract to each item in the checklist of PRISMA-A was determined by two raters independently. The primary outcome is overall adherence to the checklist, measured by the median of the numbers items adhered to. The secondary outcome includes adherence. Overall, this paper is well motivated and well written. I have the following suggestions for improvement.

1. To better visualize the results, perhaps a scatter plot (or mean plot) for the yearly trend on the average/median numbers of adhered items can be included. Likewise for individual items, a trend plot for the proportion of adherence will also be helpful.

2. To my understanding, each item will be rated as being adhered or not by two raters. How is the adherence status determined if the ratings are discrepant?

3. A minor comment: the term "over analyzed time" in the Methods section of the Abstract is a little confusing and might as well be changed to "over time"

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:
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