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Reviewer's report:

The protocol is generally clear and well-written. I have some few minor comments, which mainly concern typos and clarifications in the text.

* Page 5, Section Methods, second paragraph. It writes "The secondary outcome of the review is to identify other common factors contributing to the overall usefulness of the tests when applied to the primary care setting, in order to make research and clinical recommendations where possible." This sentence is somewhat vague, I am not really sure what the authors mean here and how it reflects to the methods section. Do they maybe mean that they aim to identify subgroups of participants for which the tests work better?

* Page 5, line 50, correct the error message "Error! Reference source not found."

* Page 6, it writes "The conventional threshold […] for the GPCOG-patient is <5 (where scores below 5 indicate impairment), and scores between 5 and 8 indicate ambiguity and require further assessment." This part is also a bit unclear. For the purposes of your review, how will you handle people with 5<GPCOG<8? As positives or negatives? What have the original studies done in such cases?

* Page 9, line 24, it writes "…. (reference chapter 10 of handbook)". Probably a typo, just write the reference

* Same page, line 34, it writes "However, we will consider using a bivariate meta regression model to estimate and compare summary points". Could the authors give some additional details about the "regression" part of this analysis? I understand they are referring to the bivariate binomial-normal model for analyzing Se-Spe, but what will they regress upon? The threshold value?
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