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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. Abstract results section - consider deleting the sentence "Only four studies were selected by all reviews." It would be justifiable to say this if all the reviews purported to identify the same study types, but this is not the case. The remaining sentences in the abstract appropriately give the results for the two types of review.

2. The above suggestion also relates to the main results section.

3. Table 2 - I found this table confusing to interpret and I'm not sure that it adds much to what's written in the text or what's included in Table 3 (see below).

4. Table 3 - consider ordering the studies by type (ie. RCTs first then non-RCTs) and adding a row below the publisher that indicates which reviews included non-RCTs. If the format and layout of Table 3 was improved, it would make Table 2 redundant.

For the OHTAC and Samson reviews, is it appropriate to say 'Not identified' against the non-RCTs when these reviews weren't including non-RCTs. It implies the authors missed these studies. Would 'Not applicable' be better?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Check the author last names in reference 40.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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