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Thank you for the opportunity to make further revisions to our paper. We are grateful for the reviewers’ time in improving our paper.

Reviewer #1: Jessie McGowan

No changes required

Reviewer #2: Chantelle Garrity

Essential revision:

The captions for the figures are on the last page of the manuscript, and we have not made any changes to these. We have added x and y axis labels to the figure files.

Discretionary revisions:

1) We have added the word “stated” to the conclusions section of the abstract, as suggested.
2) We have added a phrase to the explanation of determining eligibility as follows:
   “[One reviewer screened titles and abstracts initially, and then full texts, to determine whether the article was a systematic review] using only two criteria: that a search strategy was described, and it appeared that all eligible papers were used in the review (e.g. table of included studies or similar).
3) None of the studies in our sample were co-publications of Cochrane reviews, although there were several in the population from which we sampled. We have therefore elected not to complicate the description by including information about this.