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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for inviting me to read your revised manuscript. It has much improved. I only have some few comments.

please refer to the protocol in your manuscript by mentioning that it is in appendix 4. I was wondering how your "Anticipated or actual start date" could be 2017/03/01 as stated in the protocol? To what does this date refer? I dont believe this was the final date of the protocol as then if would have made more sense to include the years 2015 and 2016 instead of 2014 and 2015. Maybe I am missing something here.

Furthermore, please include a short statement whether there were any changes in the review compared with the protocol.

Thanks for making clear that you did not apply a strict definition of a systematic review or meta-analysis. However, relying on the statements of authors of the included studies might lead to mistakes (i.e. either you might miss relevant SRs that are not termed in that way, or you will include SRs that are in fact no SRs. This is a major Limitation and this needs to be very clearly discussed. I understand that this is a practical approach but your finding might be extensively biased. Consider including a statement that future studies should be conducted based on a clear SR definition.

I think the language of your paper still needs to be improved a lot before getting published. Thsi refers to grammatical errors, while there are also some other mistakes such as ASTAR instead of AMSTAR, for example.
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.

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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