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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reviews the quality systematic reviews of prognosis studies with the aim to identify areas for improvement in such studies in the future. It focuses on reviews of fundamental prognosis research and prognostic factor research. While I see the importance that this research can play in improving the field of prognostic research, there are several points that I would like the authors to address:

MAJOR COMMENTS

* One goal of performing such a review is to identify areas for improvement in future studies and provide initial guidance on how the improvement can be realized. It would be helpful if the authors could give more attention to the items in PRISMA and MOOSE that did not score well (e.g. risk of bias of individual studies) and discuss why these items are important and what can (or is being) be done to improve them in the future.

* The introduction and discussion were a bit lengthy and did not give a clear picture of the reporting and quality assessment tools associated with the two types of prediction studies of interest in this study. Additionally, since the focus is not on modeling studies, I think TRIPOD, should not be mentioned to avoid confusion.

* Figure 5 and 6: These are the key figures of the manuscript. I would like to be able to see a description in the figure what items were well and less well covered (e.g. words, not numbers for the items). As this may be difficult in the margins of the figure, I would suggest presenting these results in a table instead. Additionally, the confidence interval for a proportion cannot be above 1, so please redo these calculations.

* The manuscript would benefit greatly from proof editing.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

* Abstract: It should be clear in the abstract that this review only focused on 2 types of prognosis research.
* Tables and Figures: Are tables 1 and 2 the same as Figures 3 and 4? If so, it's not necessary to present both and have a preference for the figures.

* Flow chart: A flow chart showing the search and inclusion of studies should be included. It would also be interesting, if you have the information available, to see how many were type 1 or type 2 prognosis studies and to see how many prognosis reviews were excluded because they were type 3 or 4.

* Study characteristics: It would be interesting to have a baseline table with some information about the studies included, such as clinical domain and number of studies included.

* The authors mention that there are items in MOOSE and PRISMA that are not relevant for prognostic studies. Could they elaborate on which items these are and also identify them in the result tables or figures?

* Discussion: In the discussion, the authors report having included systematic reviews of "clinical prediction guides". This requires further explanation as to what it is and why they included it.
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