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Reviewer's report:

The article has been improved by the review. There are two major points to raise;

1. There is an obvious bias in that a manufacturer of US machines is co author of this article which now has been declared openly and considered by the Editor.

2. The response states that Cochrane principles for Metaanalysis is used to collect and analyse the data. I can not find corresponding pooled calculations and statistical analysis of the pooled data from the (only 2) articles referred to. The authors should provide the power analysis and state whether the used data reached this power before claiming their conclusion.

The authors still claim differences between adverse events and then go on to say that this is not significant. As commented last time either there is a significant difference or not based on the statistical analysis used. If it is not significant there is no difference simple as that.

This goes for the differences claimed between the two treatment groups aswell. Either the authors have done a power analysis for their Metaanalysis or not. Why in such case do they state that the power "may be low?" If this analysis is done, please present those data and base your conclusion clearly on your findings. If not done, please do one and reconsider the conclusion based on facts. Now again it is diffusely mentioned that "there is a difference between the two treatment groups" but why then refer to limited sample size. Again either the sample size is sufficient or not based on your power analysis. Please provide such confirmed data.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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