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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The study is very interesting. It has been described with a lot of information and several conclusions have been extracted from it. I think that the authors have done an incredible job in terms of conclusion extraction since they have reached several and interesting conclusions.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

In my opinion, most of the analysis performed is ok. It is true that probably, statistical analysis does not make sense due to the low number of final articles analyzed, so, it is impossible to, for example, analyze significance in some of the results provided. However, I think that descriptive statistics about the conclusions drawn from the analysis might help to have even a better understanding of the conclusions.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

In study selection, the authors mentioned that "Reviewers double-screened a sample of 10 percent of the total number of studies and compared results to ensure inter-rate reliability". I've not seen more information about this in the manuscript. Can you please provide more information?

In Results, authors state (second line) "no studies were included that included non-medical experts in the collective intelligence". You mean that you didn't include studies that used non-medical experts during the collective intelligence process decision-making process, right?

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

**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:

Acceptable
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