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Reviewer's report:

Thankyou for allowing me to peer review this manuscript. It is clear the authors have undertaken a great deal of work which has demonstrated the importance of quality reporting in research. Overall there are some issues with the English used throughout the manuscript and it would be beneficial for grammar and syntax to be reviewed prior to re-submission. Please see detailed comments below

Abstract

'50% to 80%' should be '50% to 79%' (applies to main manuscript as well)

Background

The authors use the term 'high quality' multiple times in this section but do not expand on what is considered high quality

The Background doesn't acknowledge the importance of the conduct of reviews as well as the reporting

Line 32 - is 'embodied' the right word here?

Line 55 - is 'rigorous' the right word here?

Please explain why the date range was chosen
Method

Lines 21-25 - It would be useful to state that a combination of keywords and index terms were used

Line 32 - please clarify 'aggregate' in this context

Please indicate when the search was run. Was it only limited to English language?

Please clarify what is meant by extracting 'Journal information' - what that title? Speciality?

What is meant by 'Here the funding information is extracted based on full-text'?

For the two additional items that were added - how was these selected?

Results

The number of DRMAs published in specialist journals and general journals does not add up to the total DRMAs

The last paragraph under general characteristics refers to 'finding' which I assume is supposed to be 'funding'. What is meant by 'company' in '1 by company'? More detail is needed

Third paragraph under 'adherence rate of each reporting item' (methods section) refer to 3 items (line 50) however it describes 4 items

Fifth paragraph under 'adherence rate of each reporting item' (discussion section) please check figures and narratives as they don't match up

Check the sentence 'The scores ranged from 5 to 13...' as the figure suggests it should be 4 instead of 5

Some clarity on how/why the particular risk factors were chosen would be useful

Discussion

The English used in this section needs some revision particular the third and last paragraph
Table 1

Please clarify 'Abstract structure' - does this mean the inclusion of headings?

Why is 'epidemiology or public health' a separate category here? Was this mentioned in the manuscript?

Should 'Region' be 'Region of author'?

Journal distribution is a different term to what's in manuscript - what does this mean exactly?

Please check the number of decimal points used here and in the main text as there are differences?

Abbreviation not explained

Figure 1

Some narrative on the reasons for full text exclusions could be included in the main text

The reason 'Contains source study' is not clear

Does 'without full text' mean that full text could not be obtained?

Abbreviation not explained

Figure 2

'Rationale for the review' is referred to as 'objectives' in the main text

Figure 3

It should be useful to provide the PRISMA abstracts checklist as supplementary data instead of the full PRISMA checklist as this would give figure 3 more context in terms of how each item was met

Title and axis do not provide sufficient detail. The figure should be understandable as a standalone without the manuscript text
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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