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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Query

Reviewer 1

Comments 1 – 5: The authors acknowledge the comments and suggestions by the reviewers. The authors have substantially revised the article. In particular, the authors have reduced the content and objectives of the paper. Similarly, the authors have changed the design of the paper from “systematic review” to a “descriptive design” and further changed the use of “abstracts” to “conference abstracts” throughout the paper. Again, the authors have changed the phrase “reporting gaps” to “gaps in reporting”.

Comments 7 – 14: The authors have revised the comments and suggestions by the reviewers. In particular, the authors have clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria section. The inclusion criteria is specifically related to abstract that focused on at least one of the sub-themes of the conference. However, abstracts that were excluded were unstructured and presented as narration.
Again, the authors have revised the framework used to guide the assessment. For instance, the data extraction forms covered information captured in some section of the reporting standards and previous literature. Similarly, the authors have revised the phrase “included studies” to “included abstract”.

Also, the phrase in “line 48”, "...half of the included abstracts were conducted in Ghana..." - does this relate to the country where the studies reported in the abstracts were conducted? Refers to abstracts of studies conducted in Ghana.

Comments 15 – 16: The authors have responded to the queries by the reviewer, by revising the interpretation of the results. The results section present only the interesting findings. Again, the authors have revised the objectives and so some information have been omitted.

Comment 17: The authors have revised the section for clarity. In particular, the section described abstracts that reported quantitative information and so requires analysis of the relationship between the dependant and independent variables. The authors have revised the section accordingly.

Comments 18 – 20: The authors have responded to the comments and suggestions by the reviewer. The authors have cross-checked the numbering of tables and figures. Again, although the authors acknowledge that the study was not a systematic review but the flow chart is relevant to give clear picture of the selection process of the abstracts.

Comment 21: The authors have revised the list of figures. In particular, figure 2, provide a clear picture of the various section of the methods that were reported against those that were not reported.

Comment 22 – 25: The authors have responded to the queries by the reviewers. The frequencies refers to the number of abstracts reporting a particular issue. For instance, in the study design section of table 2, each frequency represent the number of abstracts reporting the type of study design.
Comment 26: The authors have responded to the reviewers query by revising the columns 'Suitable design', 'Suitable methods', 'Suitable sampling', 'Suitable data collection', 'Data analysis suitable'. The authors have deleted these information since it’s the authors’ judgement regarding the appropriate design based on the research question.

Comment 27: The authors acknowledge the comments made by the reviewer regarding the data extraction form. However, the authors feels the data extraction form should remain as part of the appendix.

Comment 28 – 30: The authors have revised the discussion section. In particular, authors have reduced the discussion, addressed the importance, the implication and compare to other literature on the gaps in reporting abstracts.

Reviewer 2

Introduction: The authors wish to clarify that the authors were not involved in the review of the conference abstracts. Also, there authors there is no ethical approval for this study. However, the authors employ several measures to minimize the effects of any limitations.

Results: The authors have revised the results to ensure consistency in the interpretation of the results

Discussion and conclusion: The authors have revised the discussion and conclusion section. In particular, the authors have discussed the results in the context of previous literature on gaps in reporting abstracts. Also, the authors have revised the conclusion.