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Overall, I feel this systematic review is a step in the right direction and applaud the working group for taking this on. I have described my comments in the next paragraphs.

Comment 1

It would be helpful if the authors describe "users of evidence" instead of "readers" (for example on page 4, line 24)

Comment 2

I believe the Background section would benefit from a short example of a DRMA for those users that are not familiar with this type of metaanalysis.

Comment 3

It would be helpful if the authors clarify whether they submitted a protocol of their review to Prospero or if there is any protocol available of this review.
Comment 4

I think there is a reference missing from the paragraph in page 4, line 58: "Knowing about the abstract reporting is useful for further studies and helpful to form the standard reporting checklist specific to DRMA."

Comment 5

Ideally, the search strategy needs to be checked by a librarian. Was it the case in this review? If yes, please clarify it.

Comment 6

It would be helpful if the authors change the words "some artificial" in 7, line 5 for: "…that this kind of division is arbitrary."

Comment 7

Did the authors search for grey literature? Please clarify.

Comment 8

It would be helpful if the authors, in the inclusion and exclusion criteria, describe those carefully since, for instance, the exclusion criteria are not the opposite of the inclusion criteria.

Comment 9

It would be helpful if the authors are consistent in the terms throughout the document: for instance, they mention cross-sectional survey and epidemiological survey indistinctly. Please clarify.

Comment 10

It would also be helpful if the authors describe how they calibrated/pilot tested the title and abstract, and the full-text screen process.
Comment 11
It would be helpful if the authors clarify why they decided to search from 2011 to 2017. Thanks.

Comment 12
It would be helpful if the authors clarify the implications of using a PRISMA abstract checklist modified. From a methodological point of view, there are significant flaws in changing items of a scale without prior validation of this change. There are also some considerations the author needs to describe as they developed the scoring system to assess the information of each item. This approach has to be explained explicitly with its methodological implications on the data analysis and drawing conclusion of their results.

Comment 13
Please adapt the discussion, and conclusion according to the observations described above.

Overall, despite the many points, I raise for this systematic review, it is a critically important work in its field.

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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