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Reviewer’s report:

Comments to the Authors

This is a very interesting article. I have to admit that I have struggled with the “Other bias” domain every time I use the Cochrane RoB tool. It is nice to see that the issue has been raised through the purpose of this SR. I will provide my comments in the order of appearance throughout the manuscript with general comments.

General comments

The major weakness of this study is a lack of systematic methodology to conduct the review regarding developing a protocol, the screening process (title and abstract, and full text), and the data extraction. There is no information about the SR protocol. Furthermore, the screening work was not done in duplicate, and there is no description of the full-text screening in the paper. Only 10% of that data extraction was checked for a second reviewer. Having done all these steps in duplicate will decrease the chance of missing important papers and information from the screening process and data extraction process respectively.

If the systematic review authors want to publish this study, I will encourage them to:

- Describe the protocol of the SR in supplementary material.
- Describe all steps for the title and abstract screening, full-text screening, and data abstraction processes.
- Follow the PRISMA statement for reporting this SR.

Finally, I will suggest to the authors to compare their findings with the new Cochrane RoB tool for RCT that was launched in the past Cochrane Colloquium deeper.

Specific comments

- The authors may want to inform how many CSRs included RCT and NRS?
- Could you define what do you mean by specific partial data (page 10, row 181)?

- This is critically important work that deserves to be published, but it is necessary to improve the methodology and the discussion sections.

- Thanks.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
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