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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Not discussed is the article by Hammerschlag et al (2011; http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20953418), which suggests improvements in STRICTA:

"Analysis...over the 10-year period...with STRICTA-based questions improving by 17% (P < .001; 95% CI = 0.006–0.017). While a similar increase in CONSORT-related reporting in acupuncture RCTs was observed by Prady et al. [34], the STRICTA-related increase was not previously observed, a difference likely related to the inclusive (present study) rather than sampling (Prady et al.) approaches utilized."

This info should be added to background (e.g. lines: 8-19) & implications (e.g. lines: 211-212) sections and discussed in the context of their findings.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Suggest amending abstract summary section to include specific examples of implementation strategies. This is emphasized as the key area for improvement by the authors, such as those outlined in the "Implications" & "Summary" sections of the paper.

2. Suggest amending the summary section. The last paragraph focuses on "validity" and detracts from the message/theme of "implementation strategies" outlined in lines (#327-329). Perhaps the order is amended?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests'