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Reviewer's report:

These authors have not adequately addressed my queries. To be fair, I have not been able to access a version of the manuscript that highlights what changes have been made - so it has been time consuming trying to identify changes. However, I am not sure that many changes have been made.

A few examples:
1. I asked for clarification of the way articles end up in methodological reviews and then end up in guidelines. The authors have pointed me to figure 4 which was in the first version of the paper that I reviewed and describes where the current study fits into a process for developing guidelines. This has not addressed my comment.
2. I had a series of questions about Table 1. Table 1 has not been changed in any way since I read the original manuscript. The table ought to be self explanatory and, in my view, it is not.
3. I queried the simple random sampling of papers for a review. I have not heard of this before and cannot see how it makes any sense. The response has been that it is common to do this with a citation to their own publication where they have sampled papers in the context of registered clinical trials. This is not evidence that samples are commonly taken in methodological reviews.
4. I queried the calculation of specificity and sensitivity. The authors have reiterated what they said in the manuscript and directed me to look at the Data Analysis section. This section appears to be unchanged from the previous version. Since I reviewed the paper in March, I have read this section and it is not clear that the calculations make sense. The sections either needs to be written more carefully or they need to reconsider their calculation. Neither of these things appear to have occurred.
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