Reviewer’s report

Title: SANRA – A Scale for the Quality Assessment of Narrative Review Articles

Version: 0 Date: 11 Dec 2018

Reviewer: Armen Yuri Gasparyan

Reviewer’s report:

This is a well designed and properly conducted study. I would like to add a few comments.

1. Background. It would be correct to avoid referring to narrative review as "unreliable" (3rd para, 1st line). There are numerous redundant systematic reviews that add nothing to the global pool of evidence medicine (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27620683). Whereas narrative reviews of experts in their fields, which are published by review journals (e.g., Nature Review series, Expert Opinion in series) are more helpful.

2. Discussion. The authors present a valid option for evaluating narrative reviews. However, it is advisable to amend the SANRA, particularly its Item 3 - Description of the literature search. Points on whether searches through globally recognized multidisciplinary (i.e. Scopus, Web of Science) and specialist databases (MEDLINE/PubMed, CINAHL, Global Health, PEDro, SPORTSDiscus etc.) were employed or not could be added to the SANRA.
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