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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory revisions:
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. A Table 1 listing inclusion criteria is referenced in the manuscript but seems to have been removed.

Discretionary Revisions
2. Percents have been added, but I think to too many significant digits. I would prefer these rounded to one decimal place as the unit of measurement is whole reviews, studies etc.

3. “The 43 reviews included in the analysis at this stage were published between 2007 and 2012 inclusive with the majority having publication date of 2012 (see Figure 31 Systematic reviews per publication year). “ I do not think figure 3 is necessary – simply note the proportion published in 2011 or 2012.

4. I do not think Figure 4 Number of Databases Searched is necessary, the distribution is apparent from the description in the text.

5. Figure 5 is very helpful.
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