

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5294

Title: Duplicates in Systematic Review: A Critical, but Often Neglected Issue

Reviewer code: 00225335

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-08-28 14:43

Date reviewed: 2013-09-05 16:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well-written paper. Minor comments: 1. Summary: few systematic review reported the... should be corrected to: few systematic reviews reported the... 2. Methods to find duplicates. Suggest expanding this section to cover more details.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5294

Title: Duplicates in Systematic Review: A Critical, but Often Neglected Issue

Reviewer code: 02445767

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-08-28 14:43

Date reviewed: 2013-09-18 14:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is confusing! It is not clear what the purpose is nor is it clear as to what literature the authors have reviewed in order to come up with their results? Is this based in published studies or original data the authors have developed? The abstract should be structured and provide results! Why on report on the prevalence from 4 systematic reviews? Biased! The results have no structure. Figure 2 does not provide any information that cannot be placed in the text. Figure 3 makes no sense, please explain.