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Reviewer's report:

1. Was the literature review conducted in consultation with an information specialist? What were the dates of such searches and why restrict to only two databases. Searching economic databases may have yielded more studies. Acknowledge that non English or Non-German were excluded

2. A good attempt to come up with some quality reporting elements for an AHP. Additional suggestions include description of the hierarchy, and what if any primary assumptions of the AHP were violated and or considered.

3. In terms of the process, was there an attempt to contacts authors for missing data?

4. Please make a distinction between study reporting and study quality. The association between study reporting using checklists is no substitute for study quality. As illustrated here the applications have been quite elevate so generalized reporting guides may not be useful. Minimum necessary reporting guides like PRISMA may be a better precedent.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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