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Reviewer's report:

The authors have paid close attention to the reviewers’ comments and improved their manuscript. I include responses to a couple of unclear changes in the revised manuscript and a few minor points below. In various ways my comments address how can the manuscript be written to reflect high quality scientific standards.

The authors may consider revising the grammatical expressions they use to report their methods and findings in order to make their writing more scientific. E.g. Instead of “we considered systematic reviews”, consider revising to “systematic reviews were considered”, or instead of “we found x studies”, consider revising to “x studies were identified”. Further, a few expressions throughout the text could be revised to reflect a more technical and scientific wording. E.g. page13/para2: consider revising the sentence “Our decision...” to “Methodological diversity in the measurement of the primary outcome in the included studies has the capacity to introduce heterogeneity potentially affecting the results of a meta-analysis; thus descriptive synthesis of the effect data was followed”. Likewise, in page14/para1: consider revising the sentence “Surely, synthesising...” to “It should be noted that descriptive synthesis of the results does not eliminate limitations as uncertainty regarding...”. The above are only a few examples and such changes are encouraged throughout. (DR)

Specific responses to previous queries:

#1: The aim should be to systematically review “the literature”. (MER)

#2: I am still not clear about the authors’ point. If it is about identifying studies through existing work, they may consider a different expression like “as a first step overviews of systematic reviews and systematic reviews were identified through reference lists. Then, we considered...”. On the other hand, if it about initial literature study, this should be mentioned in a different step as it is not part of the literature search per se. (DR)

#4: The journals that the authors “expect” is a very subjective criterion, some justification is required like the journals with the highest impact factors in the field, with the most citations, or most commonly publishing relevant papers etc. (MER)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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