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Author’s response to reviews:

First, I want to thank the reviewer for the helpful comments.
Please find below how we dealt with the reviewers’ comments.

1. We added the requested comment at the end of the data analysis section:
“Parametric statistics were chosen for our analyses. As not all variables were
distributed normally, we also conducted the respective nonparametric analysis.
However, since all of the results of these two procedures were similar in
magnitude and direction, we chose to report the results that we consider to be
more user-friendly to clinicians, which are the parametric results.”

2. We now report the standard deviations of all our variables. We agree with the
reviewer that for meta-analytic purposes, this is the better measure to report.
Effect sizes: We computed the partial eta squared and inserted an additional
column in table 2 reporting the respective values.

3. The sentence now reads: “However, Barrash et al. [26]…

4. We finally found and deleted the double period.