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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The abstract background is currently methods. From reading the abstract it is not at all clear why this study was conducted, why it is necessary to conduct this study and the context. The research need of this work needs to be made clear.

2. The authors refer to their own previous work in methods. They need to describe in sufficient detail to be understood by someone not familiar with their work what the methods undertaken were. In particular:

   a. it is not clear how the systematic review format was developed
   b. what were the differences between the control and test groups

3. Recruitment rate is very low, especially as this is the pilot for an online RCT. Was a followup email sent? How will authors address this issue in the RCT? Will the participants be from the same cohort used in the pilot (in which case recruitment rate may end up being even lower)?

4. Is this a feasible and sustainable method for providing access to systematic reviews? Will not some context be lost in the process?

5. How is this proposed format different from the summary that is already provided in systematic review abstracts and exec summaries?

6. Is this method to be applied to individual systematic reviews or will it also be used to conduct analysis of multiple systematic reviews on the same subject?
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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