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**Reviewer's report:**

The question posed is not new but is well defined and relevant. The review is well written and uses good methods with enough detail. The data is complete and the authors adequately adhere to current standards.

The description of the results is good, but it would help to have a table comparing the basic differences of the systematic reviews included; what I suggest is to add a table summarizing and comparing the main characteristics of each SR; methods, inclusion criteria, outcomes and quality assessment tools.

The discussion is clear and well presented.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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