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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. This is a growing and important area of research. I would like to note that the systematic process undertaken was thorough and appropriate and followed the understood processes necessary. The included articles and conclusions drawn from them are appropriate and it is noted that this review should lead to some valuable research being conducted to close this obvious evidence gap.

Major essential revision:
1. Only three data bases were searched, in particular PubMed was not searched.

Minor Essential revisions:
1. In the introduction the term dietary patterns is used, without a clear definition of the interpretation the authors wish to impose. This is a widely used term with a variety of interpretations, the paper would benefit from a stated definition.
2. Method: inclusion criteria did not include RCT or similar study design, is there a reason they were specifically not included? This is level 2 evidence and if present should be included. The heterogeneity is such that such different study design would not impact on presentation of results.
3. Method: Were there any date restrictions imposed?
4. Method: Why was the grey literature not consulted, web of science and the dissertation database are important sources of data.
4. How were the search terms decided. Did you undertake a preliminary search and use MeSH headings to inform the search terms. This is the key to the systematic review and a bit more detail around the keywords and use of Bollean phrases is important. It may also be useful to search key authors in the field.

Discretionary
1. The use of a flow chart rather than descriptive text for the included excluded studies is an effective tool in presenting this research.

I would like to see the authors draw some recommendations together to provide future researchers with some 'aids' to designing research in this area with a view to providing good scientific evidence to fill the evidence gap outlined in this paper.
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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