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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a very interesting and comprehensive commentary on the current state of systematic reviews. I offer a few suggestions for revision:

(1) The section entitled "Evidence Ecosystems..." (pg. 3) is a powerful and interesting introduction to your topic, but your actual Introduction section (pg. 1) is boring. Consider moving this introduction paragraph to the interior of your "Evidence Ecosystems..." section. It is important to inform the reader that this paper is an update to a previous paper, but that information does not need to be in the first sentence of the manuscript.

(2) Please describe the profession/position of Helga Nowotny (pg. 3, line 44). She is not well known to all readers.

(3) The "Structure and Components of Reviews" (pg. 19) and "Breadth, Depth, and 'Work Done' By Reviews" (pg. 21) sections are far less comprehensive than the "Review Aims and Approaches" section (pg. 7). The "Breadth, Depth..." section is particularly short, with a discussion of rapid reviews and a limited bulleted discussion of the resources required to conduct reviews (pg. 22). Consider eliminating the "Breadth, Depth..." section, moving the rapid review discussion to the "Structure and Components of Reviews" section (as a rapid review is a type of review), and eliminate or expand the bulleted resources discussion. Simply listing four bulleted points about resource use is not very useful for the reader.
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