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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent manuscript. The systematic review and meta-analysis addresses an important topic, is well-written throughout, is clear in its description of the methodology and results, utilized proper methods, adequately acknowledged and explained the limitations of the study, and drew appropriate conclusions based upon the study data and methods employed. I have no major compulsory revisions and offer only the discretionary revisions provided below:

- Page 4: "Forward operating bases" may not be clear to many readers and thus may warrant a very brief explanation

- Page 5: The authors may want to provide more clarity or explanation on how the data presented in graphic form was estimated.

- Pages 5&6: The authors may want to state that use of non-specific DS are relatively common. Thus, the prevalence of DS use may actually be underestimated.

- Page 11: Does "in the main" mean "generally" in this context?

- Page 11: Multivitamins "that" men should be "than" men

- Page 11: When describing Table 3 and the lack of homogeneity, I would describe in parentheses "Q statistic p-value > 0.05" to convey how this statement was determined.

- Page 15: The authors provided an objective assessment of the literature on vitamins C & E. When discussing the literature, the authors may want to include the recently published vitamin E and Alzheimer's paper in JAMA: Dysken et al. 2014 Effect of vitamin E and memantine on functional decline in Alzheimer disease: the TEAM-AD VA cooperative randomized trial. JAMA. Jan 1;311(1):33-44. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.282834.

- Page 18: Is "chromine" correct, or did the authors mean "chromium"?

- Table 2: I would suggest abbreviating caffeine as "caff" instead of "c".

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.