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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors provide a well-considered methodology that is clearly communicated. There are a few comments, omissions and typos that should be addressed before this is published, detailed below:

p. 4 line 77: overviews are also referred to as 'umbrella' reviews.

p.4, Background, second paragraph 'We are aware of…' You need to more clearly differentiate and emphasize why your reporting guidelines are different from the three you cite. Are Onishi & Furukawa and Singh's guidelines for overviews of effectiveness reviews? It is not clear. Also perhaps lead with the point that yours are the only ones based on EQUATOR recommendations as the key difference.

p.5, line 111: '…to our knowledge…' Did you contact the authors? If yes, say that. If not, why not? How will your work build on theirs? Otherwise it's duplication of research effort and may be seen as wasteful.

p.7, line 162: 'reporting a sample of overviews of healthcare interventions published from 2012 to 2016…' If as you argue the methods for overviews are evolving, this should be updated to the current year. Sorry.

p.13, line 310: 'We may also investigate the use of novel channels…'

p.14, last paragraph: I would recommend being clear here that this work will result in an evidence-informed, consensus-based reporting guideline of overviews of effectiveness reviews, to distinguish it from the others that you located.

Good luck with this project - I look forward to seeing how it develops.
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