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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is clearly written and includes an acceptable level of detail of the methods used. I have listed my comments below:

- What motivated this overview? I am unconvinced with your Introduction section. Why does the research community need this question answered? Hasn't it been answered rather convincingly before? Inconsistencies with abstracts and full publications is a well-documented problem in various fields.

Methods

- What are surveys in this context? I don't understand the study design to address this question.

- How were systematic reviews defined?

- Why were studies excluded if they were in duplicate? Do you mean that one copy was retained?

- I don't see why AMSTAR items 9 and 10 were not relevant.

Results

- What does "health science" mean?

- The separation by health science, RCTs, veterinary science, etc. seems incorrect. There are RCTs in health science, veterinary science, etc.
- I did not find Figure 2 useful.
- I did not see Kappa statistics for your screening and data abstraction.

Discussion
- This section is well-written!

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.

Unable to assess

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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