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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you allowing me to read this paper.

Strong work!

Here are some minor comments from my side.

Abstract

Please re-write the abstract as currently, there might be some confusion between the main 'purpose' (linked to ketamine?) and primary (incidence rate of shivering- add between ketamine and placebo) and secondary outcomes (side effects of drugs?-Add ketamine here as well).

Methods.

Language restrictions were not used. Please re-write this as surely literature was excluded if content was not understood by the authors? Perhaps add which languages are understood by the authors.

Studies were excluded if other drugs besides ketamine were used. This seems to contradict the overall conclusion that large RCT are needed with anti-shivering regimens (If this implies multimodal regimens, perhaps these studies are already conducted but 'excluded' from this meta-analysis…) Please explain.
Discussion

Please restructure the discussion as following:

"In the present study… In total… Were analysed….

Ketamine was first synthesized in the early 1960s as a safe alternative to phencyclidine [26]….

Ketamine is predominantly utilized as an anaesthetic agent that induces analgesia but for a long time it has been criticized for some of its side effects which include the induction of a psychedelic state causing agitation and hallucinations [30].

The key finding of our analysis…”


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

Yes

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

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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:
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