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Reviewer's report:

Page 2, Line 9: this is not a systematic review design type; rather I would suggest literature review or narrative review

Page 4 first paragraph: grammar (genetics and not genetic), BRAF needs to be fully spelled out for the reader please

Page 4, Line 55: this statement seems to indicate case and effect relationships with cohort studies although this is not possible. Associations would be a better descriptor of the cohort study here

Page 6, Line 7: was this protocol published? If so, this needs to be referenced.

Page 7, search: I'm not sure if this search string terminology is the best way to return all relevant cohort studies. Can you limit your search in other ways? A risk of bias is raised here

Methods: overall, I am unclear how you determined that the individual studies were indeed cohort studies. I see that you operationalized your search to point towards cohort studies, however, there appears to be a crucial missing step we hereby the review team actually confirm that the study was indeed a cohort study. I think this is a critical piece of the process and needs to be well articulated in the paper. I see reference to this in the PRIMSA diagram, however, it seems to be missing from the language int he study.

Page 9: Risk of bias screening. Did you omit any studies based on their risk of bias? I see the use of a tool to assess risk of bias, however, I cannot seem any reference to applying the results of that tool to the selection of studies to be included. I would recommend moving this section to the section preceding data because it would make more sense, methodologically, to screen for bias first before dealing with data points.

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

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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