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Reviewer's report:

The objective of the manuscript was to investigate the quality of the abstracts reported in dose-response meta-analysis and to evaluate potential factors influencing quality. Although it is true that it is a manuscript with a novel theme and that it is well structured and organized, it requires changes and improvements in the following areas:

Title: the expression in the title "Cross-sectional survey" gives a wrong idea of the objectives and the procedure used in the article, given that the term is widely used in studies observations. I would suggest changing simply by "Literature survey".

Abstract: According to what has been said about the Title, changing the expression "cross-sectional survey" to "literature survey" is again suggested. It would also be advisable to write the objective in a similar way to that reported in the previous paragraph to the Method section.

Background: In the last paragraph, incoherence is observed in the years of the search indicated here with those shown in Figure 1. Here it is indicated that the search took place in the period of time between the years 2011 and 2017; while Figure 1 indicates that a search was carried out until December 31, 2015 and it was updated in August 2017. It is necessary to clarify this time range, as well as to state the reasons why this period of time was chosen and not another. Similarly, the words "epidemiological survey" should be changed to "literature survey".

Method:

Data source: Pubmed and Medline are often mentioned as if they were the same database, but it is not: Pubmed is not only Medline, although its main component is this database. For this reason, it is necessary to clarify whether Medline was used (as indicated in the abstract and in the Method section) or Pubmed (as indicated in Figure 1).

Data extraction: did the authors have any coding card, code book, etc., to guide the coding process?
Discussion: Again the change of the term "Cross-sectional survey" by "Literature Survey" is suggested. Likewise, and considering that the objective of the manuscript is to investigate the quality of DRMA abstracts and to evaluate the influence of a certain number of factors affecting its quality, it is necessary to discuss in depth the findings from the regression analysis, taking into account the context, the previous findings and their applicability and, of course, the antecedents exposed in the Background section. It would also be interesting to include some discussion on the extent to which the methodological quality of the meta-analysis included can influence the results obtained. In summary, the improvement of the Discussion section is transcendental to move from a summary of the findings to a true discussion of the results.

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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