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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have made a great job. This has improved this interesting manuscript really a lot. I only have some minor comments:

- thanks for clarifying the issue with your PROSPERO Registration. Things are much clearer now after your JCE paper has been published. Nevertheless, your PROSPERO registry record is about your JCE publication, it does only partly relate to this manuscript. I think this is now well elaborated in the main text, while the Statement in the abstract "An a priori protocol was published in PROSPERO (PROSPERO 2016:CRD42016053181)" is still misleading.

- I suggest to delete Appendix 4 as PROSPERO is freely available and accessible.

- Method section: "... levels with similar cutoff points used by most of studies for low (0-4), moderate (5-8), and high methodological quality (9-11) respectively". I don’t think there is a reference for your statement that this is the most frequent categorization. Consider stating "one of the most..."

- thanks for being clear why you do not have any reviews rated with an unclear risk of bias when applying ROBIS. I can follow your choice from a statistical point of view. However, this leaves me with the question whether this choice was made post-hoc (as this is not part of the protocol)? Please comment whether it would have been feasible (or why not) to run your analysis with an ordinal/nominal scale for ROBIS (i.e. low, unclear, high RoB). Please state how many Reviews were originally rated as unclear risk of bias and how many were than categorized into either high or low risk of bias

- I am still struggling with the Cochrane Affiliation. Do you simply mean Cochrane Reviews vs. non-Cochrane Reviews (this would not Need any further Explanation). Cochrane Affiliation is not clear to me, as I am thinking of authoring a Cochrane Review (Cochrane affiliated?), while I can also publish a non-Cochrane Review at the same time

- how did you calculate the median IRR?

- table 2: you only report significant findings from the multivariate analysis. As reporting should not rely on significant findings, all effect measures should be reported

- Discussion: Abbreviation RS - should probably read SR??
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