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**Reviewer’s report:**

The article is well written, setup looks sound in the underlying statistical work and proces. English is okay, some minor revision of sentences. I would advice to let the work be checked by an official translator.

The conclusion is wrong. Proof is given for the fact that ACEI is better than placebo, and ACB not. No direct proof is given for the conclusion between ACEI and ARB.

The proof for the ACEI against PLACEBO are all articles older than 20 years,

The other comparisons don't give a difference. the effect in Figure 5 is driven by the differences in therapy versus placebo. IF the placebo group was taken out, no effect would be seen.

More interesting is the fact that ARB doesn't give a positive effect versus placebo.

Recommend to rewrite the conclusion about ACEI being superior than ARB.

Do an statistical analyses when the positive effect of ACEI versus placebo is seen (starting with the oldest and adding newer article and the effect on RR) how many patients are treated with placebo without extra benefit!!

Focus on the fact that there is no positive effect versus placebo from ARB.

**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.
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 recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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