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Reviewer’s report:

Protocol registration

• Will the authors register the protocol with the PROSPERO? Once registered, please include a statement with the registration number in the beginning of Methods section.

Methods/design – eligibility criteria

• The authors presented their eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion) in a narrative fashion. Perhaps they could specify the same information in a bullet form by type of study design (e.g., cross-sectional, prospective cohort, retrospective cohort, case-control study), type of population, type of exposure (e.g., indicator of childhood socioeconomic status), and type of outcome (e.g., LTPI measures)?

Methods/design – study selection, data extraction, and quality assessment

• The following statement (lines 131-133) needs to be moved from ‘quality assessment’ section to study selection and extraction sections, respectively.
• Will the authors provide the PRISMA study flow chart (graphical depiction of study screening, eligibility, and exclusion processes)?

Methods/design – data synthesis

• Will the authors provide more details on what will be the summary (statistical parameters) of association and variability measures for each individual study (e.g., risk ratio, odds ratio, mean difference)?
• If the authors planned any subgroup/sensitivity analysis in order to explore clinical and methodological sources of heterogeneity, please inform if there are any a priori selected factors which will be explored for their influence on effect estimates of associations between socioeconomic status and LTPI
• The authors state that they would include only English-language publications and will exclude unpublished literature. These factors are known to produce effects of publication bias. The authors also state that they will examine funnel plots to assess the extent of publication bias. Will the authors apply any methodology to adjust or minimize the effect of this type of bias?
• Will the authors explain how they are going to analyze and synthesize relevant data for their secondary objective (i.e., determine the strength of this relationship,
examine the extent to which any association is explained by the continuity of SEP from childhood into adulthood)?

• I would assume that adult socioeconomic status apart from childhood socioeconomic status would have an independent or mediatory effect on LTPI. Will the authors consider adult socioeconomic status in their analyses? If yes, how?

• Are the authors planning to assess an overall quality of evidence (‘strength of evidence’) for their primary outcome (i.e., association between childhood socioeconomic status and LTPI) using the GRADE system?

Discussion

• Will the authors highlight strengths/limitations in identified evidence (e.g., amount, validity, applicability, etc…)?

• Will the authors highlight strengths/limitations of their review (any limitations in the review methods)?

• Will the authors compare their findings with those from other systematic reviews that explored the same or similar question?

• Will the authors highlight future research and policy implications of this review?