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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

I write this review on your submitted protocol as a patient advocate and a consumer on Cochrane SRs.

This is a very well written manuscript of great importance, on which I have nothing to comment.

Only one thing for clarification, as page 17 (PDF page 18), line 17/18 states:

"It is 12 years since the PRISMA group last met, and the PRISMA Statement has not been updated since its publication eight years ago".

Is it really 'last met' or 'first met'? On page 5 (pdf 6) it says: "In 2005, a meeting was convened to update QUOROM to address several conceptual and practical advances in the methodology of SRs, and to help overcome several shortcomings identified in an audit of SRs (2). The guideline was renamed the PRISMA Statement (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses), and published in 2009 (10)." So this was the first and last meeting?

Thank you for clarifying.

With kind regards,

Bernd Arents
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