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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded well to the comments made by the peer reviewers, and have amended their manuscript accordingly.

I would only suggest a minor final corrections or clarifications:

(1) The background is long - I would suggest to remove the following two sentences on page 5 ("MA is the suggested method for investigating if and to what extent the prognostic factor of interest is associated with a certain outcome [9]. The use of MA to summarize the evidence of prognostic factors has become very popular in recent years [10,11]."

(2) In the implications (page 20), it is not entirely clear what is mean by "Perhaps, there is a need for a development of different tools for different research areas, since prognostic studies differ relative much between the different fields". Do the authors mean new risk of bias tools needs to be developed for different fields (e.g. including new bias domains); or signalling items perhaps need to be added or changed for different fields; or that the guidance for QUIPS need to be adapted across fields?

(3) There are a few typographical errors in the revised text

- Page 19 (Methodological considerations): "the number of raters and papers included in our analyses was relative few" - please change to: "the number of raters and papers in our analyses was small"

- Page 20 (Implications): "from all field" - change to "from all fields"

- Page 20 (Implications): "prognostic studies differ relative much between the different fields", - change to: "the design and conduct of prognostic studies may differ between fields..."

- Page 21 (Conclusions, last sentence): "This paper highlighted... and provide...." - change to "This paper highlights .... and provides ...."
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