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Reviewer's report:

BMC Psychiatry - 'Relaxation training for anxiety: a ten-years systematic review with meta-analysis'

This represents my second review of this manuscript; therefore, I will dispense with the traditional review of the study, methods, and results, and proceed with my comments.

First, I would like to commend the authors on the improvement in the quality of the writing. It is a significant improvement over the previous version. I also appreciated that “file-drawer” estimates were now reported. It adds considerably to the trustworthiness of the results.

I still do not find the argument for including only the previous ten years worth of studies to be very compelling. On several occasions, the authors reported that sample size issues limited their analyses (e.g., restricting the number of studies that used specific relaxation methods), but this limitation is entirely the result of their decision to use only 10 years worth of data. I know it can be frustrating to go back and code more studies (I have been forced to do that on several occasions), but in the interest of superior science and more conclusive results, I would recommend doing so.

Otherwise, this looks like a solid revision of an interesting paper.
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