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Reviewer's report:

I am generally happy with the revision. However, I would like to point out two issues that, according to my view, have not been adequately addressed.

1. I-square and Q-test:

The claim “if Q is unreliable, so I-square will also be unreliable” is clearly wrong. The problem with Q is that it is a test with poor performance. I-square is not a test for heterogeneity; it quantifies heterogeneity. Please refer to Higgins JP, Thompson SG: Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002, 21: 1539-1558.

I suggest the authors to present both Q and I-square.

2. Heterogeneity:

I feel that exploring further the heterogeneity is an important issue. Reviewer 2 (comments 5 and 8) and the Editor also expressed concerns on this matter.

I think that using the time of publication as a proxy for differences in quality of the studies and differences in definitions of pelvic pain may be useful.

I am not an epidemiologist and I have no experience in this particular field, so I will not insist.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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