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Reviewer's report:

- Please make clear why you used the term "prognostic prediction" model instead of the usual term "risk prediction model" or "prognostic model". Is there any reason?

- Will you also included studies on patients that are treated (e.g. with metformin) and if so, how will you handle the different populations/studies (only untreated patients, treated patients or both). This distinction is in particular important because in studies on treated patients risk prediction is rather a prediction of therapy response but in case of untreated patients it is a prediction of the natural course of diseases (prognosis).

- Performance of risk prediction models might vary strongly between development studies and validation studies. Therefore, I would suggest that the authors first consider the models separately and only putting all studies together if the results are quite similar.

- Please give information on the heterogeneity variance estimator and statistical software that will be used for the meta-analysis.

- Please specify what you consider to be different target populations and outcomes in the section "subgroup" analysis.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field that should be highlighted to relevant networks

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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