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**Reviewer’s report:**

Compulsory: The paper is too lengthy and not friendly written and as such could hinder potential readers. Several facts and statements are stated several times. It is suggested to shorten the text, add section headings in the Introduction and cut the the figures (especially Figs 3-15). The information on scoring could be discarded because it has not been used in the review itself and is not of great help to readers.

Minor: It is not clear why the difference between the number of studies reported to be used for the review in the flow chart (Fig 1) and the number reported in the Abstract and Discussion.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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