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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor

In response to your email of 21 July 2014 regarding MS: 1760641054136432. Please find below how we have addressed each of the issues you raised.

Figures and legends
We had already included the PRISMA flow chart and PRISMA Statements – these are pro formas and as such, the flow chart already contained a Figure legend with a logo but we have removed this. In lines 196-197 we refer to the PRISMA flow chart.

Availability of Supporting Data
As this is a systematic review, the data set is the included papers- we had already included a list of these on appendix 1. We have changed the wording within the manuscript to use the terms suggested by BioMed Central editorial policy in lines 212-213: ‘The data set (included papers) supporting the results of this systematic review is included within Appendix 1.’

Ethical approval
No ethical approval was required because this was a systematic review of published journal articles and we have added a statement to this effect in the methods section- see lines 214-215.

PROSPERO registration
This type of methodological systematic review is not eligible for PROSPERO registration because PROSPERO only accepts registration of systematic reviews with a health-related outcome. We have added a line to this effect in the manuscript- see lines 215-216.

We have taken the opportunity to correct some formatting mistakes in Appendix
1 references and to add accidentally omitted detail to the competing interests section.

Yours sincerely,
Emma France (on behalf of Nicola Ring, Rebecca Thomas, Jane Noyes, Ruth Jepson and Margaret Maxwell)