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Reviewer's report:

I am glad to see that the authors seem to have found my previous comments helpful, and I wish them luck in completing the review, as it is not without its challenges. I do have a few further comments, which again, I hope will be helpful to the authors.

1. Using the cases data from case-control studies is an interesting idea. I assuming that these cases will be included in the "pre-established CS v suggested" analyses to investigate heterogeneity. It's clear from the protocol that the patient population is key but may be difficult to tease out separate groups appropriately. If the authors could designate the primary analysis to be that using data from patients with suggested but not pre-established CS, or whatever analysis has the most clinical relevance, it could be helpful to readers.

2. I think a useful check on model fit for the bivariate meta-analytic model is to profile the likelihood of the correlation coefficient. Could the authors incorporate this?

3. I am sure that there will be a need to modify the QUADAS-2 tool. The QUADAS-2 documentation says, "It is essential to tailor QUADAS-2 to each review by adding or omitting signalling questions and developing review-specific guidance on how to assess each signalling question and use this information to judge the risk of bias." There are review-specific issues here regarding the reference standard, the heterogeneous patient population, and the potential for incorporation bias.
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