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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has an interesting title and content, but needs to some major revisions:

1- In method section, please define the duration of the searches; last date of the searches; was July 2012 or another date?

2- In result section of the main manuscript, please refer to number of references; from ....to.....after address tables1 and 2.

3- In result section; line 3 of this section and the next sentence are confusing. You said "15 studies included", then you said ref.19 and 20 excluded. But the data of ref.20 are shown in the table-1 and table-2. Please recheck tables and clear the final number of eligible studies. according to Fig-1 it is expected 15 articles not 16. You can describe at first excluded ref. and then show the final included studies.

4- In result section; in the first line of the second paragraph, please recheck the total number of the participants; the correct number is 1160. please correct.

5- In result section; table 1, please recheck "regression equation data". Randomly I checked the second formula of the ref.28; but was shown errors. the correct formula was:

\[ DBS = 1.25V - 1.09 \] (not 1.01).

So, it's better to recheck all of data.

6- In result section, tables 1 and 2 please consider regular pattern to describe the details in the first column. According to date, or Alphabetical of the authors of ref.

7- In result section, table 1 and table 2, based on previous mention the data of ref.20 should omit.

8- In result section; table 2, please describe the "Col.II". If you omit ref.20, it will omit.

9- In result section; fig. 2A-2F please clear the number of the studies in the title of each Fig.

10- In result section; fig 2E, if included ref.20 in the analysis, should be omit and re-analysis them.

11- In result section, fig 3 and 4 are optional. You can omit or not. your description in the manuscript is enough.
12- In result section; Suppl. fig 1 is correct but suppl. fig.2 is wrong. in the first fig. you have considered 15 studies, but in the second fig. they are 16 studies. You said ref. 20 excluded due to unclear its sample size.

13- in ref. section, please check for abb. of the j names of the ref.27, and 35. In addition, the abb. name of the j of ref. 38 is similar to j of the ref.32. please, correct.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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