

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	A Systematic Assessment of Cochrane Reviews and Systematic Reviews Published in High-Impact Medical Journals Related to Cancer
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Goldkuhle, Marius; Narayan, Vikram; Weigl, Aaron; Dahm,, Philipp; Skoetz, Nicole

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Iosief Abraha Regional Health Authority of Umbria, Perugia, Italy
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	12-Jan-2018

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	I acknowledge that I have reviewed the manuscript in an earlier submission. The manuscript is well designed, well conducted, clearly presented and deserves publication.
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Michele Hilton Boon MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	22-Jan-2018

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	I reviewed a previous version of this manuscript for BMJ. I continue to find this review interesting, well-conducted, and useful. Previously I made comments relating to the impact of possible co-publication or reviews, measurement of citations, and reporting of potential conflicts of interest. I feel that the authors in their revisions and responses have adequately addressed these issues. The only remaining requirement for revision is in the standard of written English. A few examples of the revisions needed are: Page 15 of 298 lines 33-35 the phrase "absence of sensitivity analyses impede readers' accessibility of the findings against the background of study quality": in addition to containing a subject-verb disagreement, this statement makes no sense Page 14 of 298 line 23 "this this" should be "thus this" Page 14 of 298 line 30 was this "an assessment of cross-sectional SRs" (SRs limited to cross-sectional studies?) or a cross-sectional assessment of SRs page 14 of 298 line 34 "It comprised of SRs" should be either "It comprised SRs" or "It consisted of SRs"
-------------------------	---

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

-Thank you very much for your review and for the constructive comments. Below, please see our responses.

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Iosief Abraha

Institution and Country: Regional Health Authority of Umbria, Perugia, Italy

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

I acknowledge that I have reviewed the manuscript in an earlier submission.

The manuscript is well designed, well conducted, clearly presented and deserves publication.

-Thank you very much for this positive judgment.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Michele Hilton Boon

Institution and Country: MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

I reviewed a previous version of this manuscript for BMJ. I continue to find this review interesting, well-conducted, and useful. Previously I made comments relating to the impact of possible co-publication or reviews, measurement of citations, and reporting of potential conflicts of interest. I feel that the authors in their revisions and responses have adequately addressed these issues.

-Thank you very much for your positive assessment.

The only remaining requirement for revision is in the standard of written English.

-Thank you this clarification. We have reviewed the paper repeatedly and marked minor adjustments in this version of the manuscript.

A few examples of the revisions needed are:

Page 15 of 298 lines 33-35 the phrase "absence of sensitivity analyses impede readers' accessibility of the findings against the background of study quality": in addition to containing a subject-verb disagreement, this statement makes no sense

-Thank you for drawing this to our attention. We have addressed this issue in the text and changed the passage to: "(...) while absence of sensitivity analyses impede the possibility of readers to assess the findings against the background of study quality."

Page 14 of 298 line 23 "this this" should be "thus this"

-Thank you for this comment. We have changed the text accordingly.

Page 14 of 298 line 30 was this "an assessment of cross-sectional SRs" (SRs limited to cross-sectional studies?) or a cross-sectional assessment of SRs

-Thank you for your comment. We have reworded this sentence into: "In 2016, a cross-sectional assessment of SRs was published which included a similar comparison of Cochrane and non-Cochrane reviews."

page 14 of 298 line 34 "It comprised of SRs" should be either "It comprised SRs" or "It consisted of SRs"

-Thank you for this suggestion. We changed the passage in the manuscript to "(...) consisted of SRs".

-Thank you very much