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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made an obvious effort in order to address all the questions and remarks posed by the two reviewers. Furthermore, in what refers to the discussion section, this reviewed version of the article provides a more in-depth discussion of the analysis and major conclusions of the analyzed articles included in their systematic review. All the tables and figures appear to be more clear and easier to read.

At this stage of the process, my advice would be the following:
- Accept after discretionary revisions.

Minor essential revisions:
1) P.14 – “This kind of treatment decisions should be based on both scientific evidence and doctor’s and patient’s preferences” – This sentence does not seem to be accurate and valid to me, since medical decisions should always be based on scientific and evidence based knowledge, and not on the doctor’s preferences… and it is based on that medical, scientifically and evidence-based knowledge that doctors choose the best medical treatment to be offered to the patient and/or according to the patient’s preferences, and after a doctor-patient or doctor-proxy communication and decision-making process.

Discretionary revisions:
1) P.6 – “extensive search strategy” – what does it mean?
2) P.7 – “Only studies that were written in English were included” – the authors have provided a justification for doing so within their cover letter; it would be of interest to have this justification in the article as well.

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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