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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, the authors appear to have addressed the main points made by the referees. They have chosen to keep the Discussion quite short and focused rather than broaden it to discuss causes for phenomena such as slow publication, but this is legitimate, since this study did not attempt to examine these factors, it simply provided a snapshot and focused on selective reporting.

I am not sure the PRISMA diagram adds much useful information and it is, perhaps, even a bit confusing as it includes both the number of studies and the number of publications. Unlike the other reviewer, I’m not convinced it is a very useful addition and would agree with the authors that, as this wasn’t a systematic review, such a diagram isn’t really relevant for this study.
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