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Overall, this is a very rigorous systematic review of a clinically relevant area of which I have little content expertise. I have only minor comments regarding the methodology but, frankly, I find the manuscript too long given the limited amount of evidence presented.

There are no compulsory reviewsions.

Discretionary revisions:
- the introduction is very long. Even if it presents a good primer in to the different types of validity I wonder if this is really necessary in that extent in a report of a systematic review.
- there are no references to the tables in the text.
- Frankly I would have prefered a checklist of quality items to the quality score. As a long-term user of scores I get more and more sceptic about ther usefulness of such scores. The scoring is not very transparent.
- If only 5 studies on content validity are available, as I reader I would, of course, be interested to know a bit more about the results in the other studies.

What I really like is the detailed informantion on excluded studies
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