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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,

Thank you for your feedback on our draft paper. We have made the following changes in response:

1) the first use of N.B. needs to be defined (page 4);
   We only used N.B. a couple of times in the paper, so have simply removed the term.

2) in section 1.2, second paragraph remove the inserted "be" (page 5);
   Thanks – this has been removed.

3) Concerning the prisma flow diagram: a box says "Full-text articles excluded, with reasons" but the reasons are not actually given. So need to state reasons for exclusion.
   We have uploaded a revised prisma diagram which details the reasons for exclusion at full text.

One other thing is that the paper is quite long. I don’t think we have a word limit, and given that this is an ambitious review and the first of its type, I’m ok with it being long. I would recommend, though, that the specific search strategy be moved to an appendix.

We have moved the search strategy to Appendix A and re-lettered the rest of the appendices accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

James Thomas, on behalf of the authors.