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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript correctly addresses almost all the remarks. A few points could further be improved in the manuscript:

1°) Conclusion of the abstract:
   « If neurological soft signs are an endophenotype or biological marker of schizophrenia, they may have value when used in conjunction with prodrome assessment tools in improving the detection of the prodrome of schizophrenia. »
   I still believe that this sentence is not an appropriate conclusion and should be removed from the abstract since the question of NSS in prodromes is not addressed in the work and remains speculative. The value of NSS as markers of prodromal markers needs to be directly explored before any conclusion.

2°) P 7 « although adequate blinding is difficult to establish » should be rephrased for « … is difficult to attain »

3°) P 7 « Since there is considerable overlap between these scales, data were included if any of these three measures were used [13]. »
   The remarks about the heterogeneity of scales should be better addressed by adding: « However, despite some similar labels, it should be kept in mind while interpreting the meta analysis that the rating and the tasks that correspond to the individual NSS items vary between the different scales. »

4°) in the conclusion:
   « A key limitation of this review was the finding of significant heterogeneity across all comparisons. » The authors should further quote the main sources of heterogeneity (sample size, age, kind of first degree relative, scales and ratings, medication, clinical features etc).

5°) the discussion about NSS being biomarkers rather than only endophenotype does not rely on the present study and remains confusing. It is not clear why the author discuss that. It could be removed.

6°) the author should be more nuanced in their conclusions by quoting the limitation of their study: only 7 studies meeting the criteria and heterogeneity that could not be further explored. The conclusion is thus that more studies using a consensual rating tool and homogeneous samples are needed.
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