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Reviewer’s report:

Minor revision

1. The author used AMSTAR and ROBIS as a quality assessment tool to assess a systematic review and meta analysis.

AMSTAR is a uniformly accepted and has a validation.

Regarding to ROBIS, the author did not introduced proper reference about ROBIS.

Please introduce a adequate reference of ROBIS

2. The author described about the limitation of the generalisability of this data because the topic of systematic review is confined to the disease of psoriasis.

But they suggested and proposed to use two decision trees to evaluate the quality of systematic review as if the topic of the reviews were not confined to the specific disease.

These might cause confusion to the readers. Please mention and describe about the limitation of these data.

3. Reference number 4, 8, 12, 14 should be rechecked and revised

4. Recheck
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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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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