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Reviewer's report:

"STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?

No - there are minor issues

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?

No - there are minor issues

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?

No - there are minor issues

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?

No - there are minor issues

Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions
STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

It has been 1 year since the search date. It is advisable that the authors renew their searches to identify newer relevant publications that could included in their meta-analysis.

Have the authors tried to identify relevant publications form the grey literature?

What is the reason for excluding extracts from this study? Were there any language restrictions for the searches?

Please provide a complete search strategy from at least one research database.

The manuscript can be improved for sentence formation, language and grammar.

Provide a reference for the I2 value cutoffs in the methods section. It is standard to have cutoffs for low, moderate and high heterogeneity rather than concluding no heterogeneity for I2 values less than 50%.

Newcastle Ottawa scale was designed to assess the quality of non-randomized studies. It is not suited to evaluate RCTs. I would suggests the authors evaluate the RCTs using Cochrane risk of bias tool.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Please review above comments.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

NA"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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