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Reviewer’s report:

General
The paper could be of some value if it introduces some healthy scepticism into the literature about meta-analyses.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. The title is not a fair reflection of the revised paper. The paper does not explain the inconsistencies; it discusses possible reasons. Moreover, the aim in the abstract 'to explore if this inconsistency can be attributed to publication bias or heterogeneity of the trials' is almost the same as the conclusion. The emphasis of the paper has to be discussion.
2. The paper still centres on the meta-analysis. If this is because a lot of clinicians trust the results of this meta-analysis (ignoring the Cochrane review) then the author should state this as the motivation for the paper. Nonetheless, the COchrane review merits more comment in this paper.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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