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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. The methods and statistics used in the meta-analysis needs confirmation from a statistician familiar with meta-analytic methods. This is especially so as more than one of the studies has used non-parametric statistics to compute results as the data were not normally distributed. I am not sure how this can be managed in a meta-analysis; the current study has used only means and SD’s.

2. It will be difficult for a clinician to understand how the meta-analysis found no effects on symptoms when all the 4 studies included have reported positive results, particularly in negative symptoms and socio-occupational functioning.

3. The study refers to ‘well-being’ when the actual scales being measured are those of ‘quality of life’. I am not sure that these terms are interchangeable and that they refer to the same construct.

Discretionary Revisions
4. The authors make these comments/ conclusions in the discussion –
   - “The primary limitation of this review is the small total number of eligible RCTs (page 15, para 3)
   - “As this review could not find any effects of yoga for schizophrenia patients that were robust against bias, it seems questionable whether further research on this topic is warranted (page 15, para 4).
   - “Future studies should ensure rigorous methodology and reporting, mainly adequate sample size, adequate randomization, allocation concealment, intention-to-treat analysis, and blinding of at least outcome assessors” (page 15, para 4).

5. The above comments seem contradictory to each other. I disagree with the second comment/ conclusion as it seems to me that the implication of the first comment is precisely that more research is needed on this topic!

6. Overall comment: May need revision before considering publication in the light of the above comments. The authors should, of course, have the freedom to accept or reject any comment.
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