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Abstract

1) In the results the authors mention "Less than 50% of abstracts adequately reported", what does the author refer to by the word 'adequately', it implies a subjective assessment. Were they studies that did not report these or was judged to inadequate by the authors?

2) Was there variations between the journals?

Methods

1) How were the four journals selected? What criteria were used to determine that they were 'major' critical care journals

2) Data extraction section not very clear

3) Again the 1 point i raised in the abstract section needs to clarified here

Discussion

1) What are the authors recommendations to improve the current situation?

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Quality of figures
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

**Statistical review**
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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