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Reviewer’s report:

This systematic review report for the first time on the SR methodological and reporting item adherence, with specific reference to the use of 4 checklists (QUORUM, PRISMA; AMSTAR and OQAQ).

Results suggest that the adherence is quite low overall, so that promoting adherence initiatives would be needed.

The manuscript is clearly written, and definitively original.

I have only few points in this regard:

- Has this SR been registered on PROSPERO website? If yes please provide the number in the methods section.

- Did authors spot any difference in the accomplishment of certain items for reporting before/after 2010 (PRISMA has been published on 2010)? Although this SR is qualitative, I would test (even not formally) if there is any change in this aspect. Results should be discussed.

- Did author test if there is any difference in methodological and reporting item adherence according to the specialty, e.g. oncology vs general medicine? Even though the number of SR included is low, this aspect might be at least checked and discusses.

- Reference 14 is missing.

- Not sure if ref 13 on page 6 is the correct one (lines 20 and 22).
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