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Reviewer's report:

Efficacy and safety of prophylactic use of ketamine for prevention of postanesthetic shivering: A system review and meta analysis

A nicely written systematic review paper. Only main critique I have is the way the abstract written. The authors should focus more on the primary outcome and related issues, instead of detailed complication descriptions. See below:

* Abstract: "Ketamine did reduced the incidence rate of postanesthetic shivering compared with placebo (odds ratio [OR]: 0.13, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.06 to 0.26, P < 0.00001)." vs. "No significant difference was found in the incidence of postanesthetic shivering for all comparisons between ketamine and other pharmacological interventions." - These statements are contradictory. Please clarify.

* Abstract: "Usage of ketamine was associated with a lower rate of hypotension and bradycardia when compared with placebo." Vs. "The occurrence of side effects caused by ketamine or other study drugs was similar with an exception of the comparison between ketamine and ondansetron where ketamine lowered the incidence of hypotension" - repetition to me. Please combine the statements.

* P6: "The following search-term strategy was used: 1) shivering; 2) tremor; 3) shake; 4) hypothermia; 5) anesthesia; 6) postanesthetic; 7) postoperative; 8) surgery; 9) ketamine; 10) 1 or 2 or 3 or 4; 11) 5 or 6 or 7 or 8; 12) 9 and 10 and 11" - It is not clear the search strategy in this description. Please clarify.
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