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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:

This was an interesting scoping review on reproducibility of clinical research in clinical care. The paper was well-written, the methodology sound, and the implications reasonable. There were a few practices identified in the review with consistent effects across studies, and it would be interesting to highlight these further in the discussion in the context of current clinical practice. A few specific comments related to clarifications follow.

Specific Comments:

- Abstract: The majority of clinical practices were reported to be efficacious in the original study, but to lack efficacy or be harmful in the reproduction attempt. I'd be interested to know the breakdown between these two, since they would have quite different implications.

- Reading through the text, I was unclear on how SR and SR-MA were being used as original studies, since they would be synthesizing the results of original studies. It was only in a footnote to Table 1 where it became clear how they were being used. It would be helpful to include a brief statement to clarify this in the main text.

- Table 2: Where the study characteristic is labeled 'Country of origin,' it seems it would make more sense to call it 'Continent of origin.'
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