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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors provided a detailed and mostly satisfactory response. Their new manuscript has improved much.

________________________________________________________________________

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Although the authors are applauded providing more detail on possible sources of clinical, methodological, and statistical heterogeneity feasibility of pooling remains highly controversial in cases of substantial clinical and statistical heterogeneity.

I suggest a second opinion from a statistician to resolve this issue prior to publication.

________________________________________________________________________

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

The authors state: "Some studies provided insufficient data in the text for meta-analysis". Please provide detailed numbers.

________________________________________________________________________

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

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

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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