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Reviewer’s report:

This short paper is clearly and systematically presented. I had only a few concerns:

1) The list of items pertains (correctly) to reporting of DTA reviews, but it is described elsewhere that the systematic review was of "existing guidance on quality of reporting and methodology" (Abstract) or "published articles pertaining to methodology or reporting quality" (Database search). The latter (guidance on DTA methodology) seems to me much wider than guidance on reporting. I would expect to find far more than 203 papers giving "guidance" on DTA review methodology, e.g. suggesting specific meta-analysis methodology in particular. Can the authors be much clearer about their inclusion criteria?

2) There does not appear to be a list anywhere of the full 203 "included" papers (e.g. Figure 1).

3) The authors have undertaken a complex search strategy and detailed screening, which must have been a huge amount of work. However, in the end we find that "Items [in the final list] were taken from 19 unique sources". It is unclear how the 203 included papers were reduced to the final 19 sources.

4) I was surprised that the list didn't include anything about reporting how multiple points on the ROC curve from an individual study were handled? (i.e. What was done if a study reported sensitivity and specificity at 2 or more different cut points?)
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