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Reviewer’s report:

I found this a clearly written and well-structured paper. I have only the following minor suggestions for discretionary revisions:

I found use of the term "study" to refer to reviews confusing. I think it would be clearer to use the term "review" or "meta-analysis" throughout when referring to such studies.

Abstract: I found the phrases "bias across studies (methods)", "bias across studies (results)" unclear. Could you expand on these?

Methods: Study Selection, First sentence – extra “then” in this sentence?

Figure: “step 1” unclear

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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