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Reviewer's report:

The main concern is about 'the quality assessment of each included study'. The authors mentioned that they accounted this in the papers inclusion but no any information can be reflexed this issue. The authors only discussed about QUADAS, a tool for quality assessment, in the last paragraph of discussion, without any relation to their study.

They should use it for quality assessment in their systematic review. The discussion should be about any weak or strength points of the tools in relation to the potential assessment.

For table 2, I suggested to change heading of 'intervention' in column 4 to be 'tests and reference' rather than heading of column 5.

Even the authors moved a paragraph from discussion to be in the results, they should considered to remove the first sentence of that paragraph.
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