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Reviewer's report:

This is a useful and well written review on meta-analysis in prognostic research. I have minor comments.

I found the manuscript hard to follow with the various distinctions between summary data, individual participant, single and two stage meta-analysis and validation and development of models. Perhaps the authors can set contact explaining the various options one has either for example validating models with meta-analysis or developing a new one. There is no discussion as to which is approach is better and when.

Related to this point, the readers are left with a variety of methods but not with an informed assessment of them, a guidance on which is better for their particular problem and the limitations and strength of each method. Maybe a table outlining characteristics would help.

Similarly, a Figure with the various options depending on summary data or individual participant data would be very helpful.
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