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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well done paper. However, there is a set of issues that could help to improve the paper. The pages were numbered from 1 to 23.

1. P(age) 5, p(aragraph) 2, l(ine) 8. Suggest replacing [a significant] by [an important] so as not to confuse with statistically significant.
3. P 12, p 3, l 6. Something seems to be missing after the [,].
4. P 15. Consider adding PRISMA, NIHR, COSMIN, and Cochrane to the list of abbreviations.

A random sample of 10 R(eference)s was checked for citation accuracy. Trials likes to publish all authors up to 30 so additional authors should replace [et al] for Rs 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25, 27, 30.

5. P 16, after p 3. Consider adding an R to PRISMA since it is identified as part of rationale in Table 1, P 22. The website http://www.PRISMA-statement.org may be suitable.
6. P 17, Rs 5, 6 and 8 appear to be correct.
7. P 18, R 12 appears to be correct.
8. P 18, R 13 should add the last access date.
9. P 20, R 22 appears to be correct.
10. P 21, R 29 appears to be correct.
11. P 22, l(tem) 3, l 3. Since [or] logically includes [and], consider deleting [and/]. Also P 22, l 7, l 5.
13. P 22, l 7, l 5. The last word on the l seems to be [should] but did not print in my copy.
14. P 22, l 8, l 3. The last word on the l seems to be [been] but did not print in my copy.
15. P 22, l 9, l 2. The last word on the l seems to be [the] but did not print in my copy.
16. P 23, l 16, l 1. The last word on the l seems to be [in] but did not print in my copy.