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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: I believe the work is a good contribution. I think in places the manuscript is a little discursive and reads as though the research evolved as it took place (which might be fine) but I don't think it gives the reader a very clear idea of the merit of the scientific methods used. In terms of the methods of study design, the process is still a little difficult to understand even though the authors do provide a good deal of narrative on how decisions were made.

I appreciate it's not an easy area to write about; essentially critiquing the methods used by other authors to critique methods and whilst I don't find the paper easy to read, I do think the overall message is an important one. It has been slightly watered down since "erroneous" has been replaced by "inadequate" but I agree that the new terminology is semantically more accurate.

Page 5- line 42

As per my original review I don't think it's appropriate to cite unpublished data in as evidence to back statements in a peer reviewed academic journal and consider that it should only be included and cited if it has been published prior to this manuscript.

The language and grammar has improved a great deal since being proof-read.

Two instances where CSR not successfully replaced on page 7, lines 51-53

Page 13. Suggested amendment to strengthen the sentence:
"Likewise, 72% of trials that only wrote about baseline balance between groups, 68% of the trials that had only a description of block randomisation or stratification, and 51% of trials for which the supporting comment only mentioned that randomisation was done using envelopes were [INADEQUATELY] judged as having a low risk of bias as well (Table 2)."

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

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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