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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
This is an interesting topic, and the paper is well-written, but the methods seem to be a little too briefly described to allow an adequate assessment of the study’s findings.

1) The precise research question that drives the review was not explicitly stated. This is essential for the reader to be able accurately assess whether your methods were adequate to address it.

2) The Methods section would benefit from having more structure. It is customary to have subheads such as “Search Criteria,” “Selection Methods,” “Quality Rating,” etc.

3) The inclusion and exclusion criteria for articles were not explicitly stated.

4) The Results and Discussion section should be two separate sections, since they have different functions. “Results” presents the findings of your review process, and “Discussion” discusses the implications, makes comparisons to other studies, etc.

5) Limitations were not explicitly addressed.

Minor Essential Revisions
1) It is usual to have a figure that visually represents how you selected and excluded articles based on your inclusion and exclusion criteria.

2) Table 2 is somewhat confusing. It would help to include totals; as it is, the reader can’t tell whether all the numbers below the first row are part of the 809 or in addition to it. Please clarify your entire process of article identification.

Discretionary Revisions
No suggestions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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