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**Reviewer's report:**

I have reviewed the revised manuscript. The authors have made changes according to reviewer's suggestions and the manuscript has improved a great deal.

I still have one fundamental issue that I raised in the first round that I believe was misunderstood by the authors (my comment number 4) and does not appear to have been addressed. The authors have assessed 14 criteria to determine 'quality of abstract reporting in SR-DRMA's' (based on what is reported by Cochrane SRs). Of the 14 criteria, some are purely items of reporting, for example, '#2 rationale for the review' or '#11. brief summary of evidence', others directly related to 'conduct' of the work. For example, to suggest 48.7% is 'poor reporting' with regards to '#8 risk of bias assessment', would seem to depend on 100% of the included SR-DRMAs actually having performed risk of bias assessment in the first place. If they haven't done it, reporting in the abstract is unwarranted and the conclusion would likely be the Sr-DRMA may be at risk of bias, not that the abstract is deficient. The abstract is dependent on the work it is summarizing. I think to completely align with the objectives of the study as presented and the conclusions, 'conduct of SR-DRMA' according to Cochrane SR should also have been determined.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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