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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revisions

The authors have addressed most of my previous comments. Although they have added a line about meta-analyses being excluded as ‘they did not collect original data’ I would suggest that this of itself is insufficient justification for two reasons. First, multiple publications from the same study (done quite legitimately) do not really collect original data, so the distinction is a little false. Secondly, meta-analyses do provide new data, though it may not be new empirical data. Having said that, the authors can quite reasonably choose to exclude them on the basis of consistency with previous studies.

For the purposes of future research, it might perhaps be helpful to include these papers as meta-analyses are becoming a more important part of medical research. There is no benefit to me from these suggestions having never published a meta-analysis.
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