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Reviewer's report:

Interesting manuscript, which provides good insight on the field of DRMA, and will be useful to continue methodological research on the field. However, the manuscript has many issues that need to be addressed before continuing the process.

The manuscript has numerous grammar and language issues, which need to be addressed. I suggest authors to consider finding a native English speaker to proofread the manuscript.

I disagree with the following statement: "The abstract reporting of DRMA is therefore expected to be more rigorous to traditional meta-analysis". The fact that DRMA explores dose-response relationship does not support the idea that these MA should have a better abstract than the regular MA. Both MA should be written in the most rigorous way.

In methods, there is no clear justification for choosing studies only from 2011. Please clarify.

I think that the rationale of focusing on dichotomous outcomes, based on the low number of continuous outcomes DMRA, is not strong enough. A low number of studies does not necessarily mean that they shouldn't be studied.

It is not clear how the decision of including an abstract to the next stage of the selection process was performed. Was an agreement between the two reviewers required? How disagreements were handled?

Regarding full text review stage: it is not clear how the reviewers reviewed them: Was this review independently and in duplicate? This should be clearly stated.

Figures need to be adjusted to improve their resolution.
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.

No

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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