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Reviewer's report:

REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution?

Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors comments and solutions appear to have largely addressed the last round of suggestions for the manuscript. The tone now strikes a better balance between criticising the accuracy of judgement made by authors of Cochrane reviews and making the case that it's unlikely to just be Cochrane reviews where such errors are happening.

I would prefer that the "CSR" acronym is not used for Cochrane Reviews as CSR also stands for Clinical Study Report therefore the use of it here is confusing when discussing systematic reviews and verification of sources, as clinical study reports are often used by systematic reviewers.

Some further proof reading and grammatical correction will be required on the newly added text. For example, on page 7 the paragraph opens "Such data extraction required programming and testing for every step to produce no errors nor missing data." This would read better as "The data extraction process required programming and testing at every step to avoid errors and flag missing data."

Also some of the newly added text are still not clear. For example, "We excluded 19 RCTs due to different risk judging - customized for more than three usual judgments (low, high and unclear)": the meaning is unclear here as to different from what? And what exactly was customized?

Page 14 bottom paragraph should be either "Cochrane" or "The Cochrane Collaboration".

There are a few other grammatical issues that will hopefully come out in the proofing process.
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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