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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your edits to the paper, I think it reads better and that my comments have been taken into account. There's just a few minor comments regarding wording.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1) p5, paragraph 2: 'We think that most of factors taken into consideration by the GRADE framework...'
   This should be modified to something like: 'We think most of the factors taken into consideration by the GRADE framework....'

2) p15: '...whether publication bias is evidence potential problem.'
   This should read something like 'whether there is evidence that publication bias is a potential problem.'

3) p16, paragraph 4: '...developing a systematically way to evaluate the quality of evidence...' could modify to to say '...developing a systematic approach to evaluate the quality of evidence...'
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