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Author’s response to reviews:

Queries 1 – 3

Authors response - The authors acknowledge the queries by the reviewer and have revised the section accordingly. The authors have also edited the entire section to address common grammatical errors. All changes have been indicated in a yellow ink.

Queries 4 – 5

Authors response - The authors acknowledge the queries by the reviewer regarding the use of “gaps in reporting”. The authors have revised the entire manuscript, by replacing the phrase with 'reporting of conference abstracts' or incomplete/inadequate/poor reporting. Again, the authors have revised the objective of the study in response to the reviewers query.

Queries 6 – 8
Authors response - The authors have revised the section in response to the reviewer’s queries. In particular, the authors have addressed the standard of reporting in the introduction and relocated information on AfriNEAD as well as the sentence at the introduction.

Queries 9 - 10

Authors response - The authors have revised the inclusion and exclusion criteria in response to reviewers query. In particular, the authors wish to address that abstracts were included when they have structured or unstructured format. However, the content should adequately cover the background, methods, results and conclusion. Contrary, abstracts were excluded if they are unstructured but do not adequately capture information on background, methods, results and conclusion and merely have a brief narration.

Queries 11 – 12

Authors response - The authors have revised the queries of the reviewers. For instance, the authors have replaced “review” with “study” throughout the manuscript. Also, the authors have introduced “selection of included abstracts” under a separate sub-heading

Query 13

Authors response - The authors acknowledge the query by the reviewer regarding the reporting standards in the data extraction. However, the authors wish to express that information regarding reporting standards has been covered in the data extraction form. For instance, the authors considered abstracts as meeting standards when they report information regarding the aim, methods (design, Data collection approaches/type of study, Participants of included studies, number of participants/included studies, sampling, location/setting, type of analysis performed, software and date of recruitment), results (number of participants ie sampled against response rate, age, gender, reporting of findings, primary outcomes) and conclusion.
Queries 14 - 16

Authors response - The authors have responded to the reviewers queries by adding a reference to the data extraction form in the appendix, adding the total number of included abstracts and adding the absolute numbers in brackets.

Query 17

Authors response - The authors have responded to the reviewers query regarding the setting of the reported abstracts. The authors wish to clarify that most of the included abstracts were studies that reported findings from Ghana.

Queries 18 – 19

Authors response - The authors have responded to the reviewers query by adding a reference to the table 5 and also reviewing the subheadings throughout the manuscript

Query 20

Authors response - The authors acknowledge the reviewers comments regarding the information on Figure 2. However, authors wish to express that the information reported in figure 2 is relevant particularly as it explain the incomplete reporting of study design, methods, sampling, and analysis and data collection.

Query 21

Authors response - The authors have responded to reviewers query by revising the second sentence (p6, line 58).
Queries 22 – 23

Authors response - The authors have revised the limitations of the study.

Queries 24 – 25

Authors response - The authors have revised the discussion as suggested by the reviewer. The authors have highlighted the real value of having well reported abstracts in disability and implications for other academic domain

Queries 26 – 27

Authors response - The authors have responded to the reviewers query by revising the section. For instance, the phrase participant group has been replaced with “participants used in the included studies”

Queries 29 – 30

Authors response - The authors wish to clarify that studies from Kenya, Malawi, Liberia, Nigeria, Tanzania, United States and Zimbabwe were group together as other setting because only one study each reported findings from these settings. Again, authors wish to express that case studies reported in table 2 is not the same as case report

Queries 31 – 32

Authors response - The authors wish to express that reporting association and reporting outcome is two different concept used in the study. The authors used “reporting association” to represent...
abstracts that reported association between dependant and independent variables. Also, authors used “reporting outcome” to indicate studies that reported primary outcome of interest in the abstracts.

Query 33

Authors response - The authors have responded to the reviewers query by adding the topics of the included abstract in table 5