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Reviewer's report:

The paper is very interesting and raises relevant aspects. Here are some suggestions and doubts:

- In the title, consider including the word "Cochrane". Not all systematic reviews were evaluated, but the systematic reviews of that specific library;

- Results, lines 16-17 "We identified and appraised 109 HIV reviews and 39 HIV protocols (148 articles in total), published in the Cochrane Library between 2000 and 2016." and Results, lines 22-23: "The majority (66%) were published between 2010 and 2016": I do not understand what you mean.

- Results, line 48: "37% were assessed as having methodological concerns": It's strange to start the phrase with number.


- Results, the last sentence- "reflecting dormancy and slow progress": This sentence should be in the discussion and not in results.

- Discussion: I missed a more focused discussion of the fact that these are the revisions and protocols of the Cochrane Library. If even with all the rigor of Cochrane there are still problems, the trend is that this is an even more serious problem than described in this study.

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

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Were you mentored through this peer review?

No