

**Supplemental Table 1. Checklist for classification of peer review comments**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Type of comment</b>
<b>Importance</b>	1. Research question and results of limited clinical relevance/narrow interest
<b>Originality</b>	2. Lack of novelty; paper does not add much to what is already in the published literature
<b>Background and rationale</b>	3. Incorrect/missing background information in introduction 4. Poor justification for conducting the study; insufficient problem statement/rationale provided
<b>Methods</b>	5. Poor experimental design; methodology/study population/data collection methods flawed or questionable 6. Methods inadequately reported; trial design, participants, interventions, outcome measures used, sample size calculation, randomisation, or blinding inaccurately described 7. Statistical analysis methods inappropriate or inadequately reported
<b>Results</b>	8. Results not answering study question, study outcome data incomplete, results inaccurately presented 9. Flow of participants through the study unclear; no explanations provided for non-randomized/excluded subjects or drop-outs
<b>Discussion and conclusion</b>	10. Meaning of study results inadequately discussed; potential explanations and implications insufficiently addressed in discussion 11. Study insufficiently related to prior work in the literature; not discussed how study results support or disagree with previous research 12. Limitations/shortcomings of the study not acknowledged or not sufficiently discussed how they might affect the study results and their interpretation 13. Conclusions inappropriate in relation to study design or results, or overinterpretation of results
<b>Abstract</b>	14. Abstract does not correctly reflect the paper; information in abstract incomplete/inaccurate 15. Discrepancies between data reported in abstract and main text of the paper
<b>References</b>	16. References missing in article, or outdated/irrelevant references used 17. Errors in reference citation; references not appropriate for statements they are meant to support
<b>Presentation</b>	18. Title not representative of the study 19. Poor writing; typos, unclear language, incorrect terminology, text difficult to follow, wordiness, incorrect use of sections in paper 20. Inaccurate/absent/incomplete tables or figures, discrepancies between tables, or discrepancies between main text and tables
<b>Ethics</b>	21. Not clear which research ethics committee provided approval for the study 22. Informed consent procedures inadequately reported, or other ethical issues related to the study
<b>Trial registration, protocol, CONSORT</b>	23. Trial registration absent/incomplete or registration number missing, study protocol not published/provided by authors, or CONSORT statement/diagram missing 24. Deviations from the trial registry or protocol; not adequately explained why these deviations occurred
<b>Conflicts of interest</b>	25. Potential bias introduced by author conflicts of interest, or funder's contribution to the study unclear 26. Systematic bias or spin in the interpretation of results in favour of the study sponsor

**Supplemental Table 2. Inter-rater agreement for final classification checklist**

Type of comment	Percentage of agreement
1. Research question of limited clinical relevance	93.1
2. Lack of novelty	94.4
3. Incorrect/missing background information	93.1
4. Poor justification/rationale for conducting study	97.2
5. Poor experimental design	86.1
6. Methods inadequately reported	84.7
7. Statistical analysis methods inappropriate	81.9
8. Study outcome data incomplete	83.3
9. Flow of participants through study unclear	94.4
10. Meaning results inadequately discussed	77.8
11. Study insufficiently related to literature	91.7
12. Limitations not sufficiently discussed	76.4
13. Conclusions inappropriate/overinterpretation	84.7
14. Abstract does not correctly reflect paper	91.7
15. Discrepancies between abstract and main text	98.6
16. References missing/irrelevant references used	95.8
17. Errors in reference citation	95.8
18. Title not representative of study	97.2
19. Poor writing	91.7
20. Inaccurate tables or figures	88.9
21. Ethics committee approval not clear	98.6
22. Other ethical issues related to study	98.6
23. Registration/protocol/CONSORT missing	97.2
24. Deviations from registry or protocol	100.0
25. Bias by author COIs/contribution funder unclear	100.0
26. Systematic bias or spin in favor of sponsor	98.6