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Reviewer's report:

The authors efficiently responded to the previous comments and the manuscript is in a very good shape.

Below, I include some minor edits:

* The phrase "systematic meta-review" is not appropriate to describe the study. Instead the authors could use the term "systematic review" or "overview of systematic reviews".

* page 4: The study selection process is appropriately described. However, it would be better to write a structured paragraph.

* page 6, line 16: It is not clear what this "weighted median effect size" means. Which measure of effect was used. Given that the outcome is a continuous variable, I would expect describing here the effect size metric (e.g. weighted mean difference, standardized mean difference, correlation coefficient). Also, the authors should describe what the numbers inside the brackets represent (e.g., 95% confidence intervals, or inter-quartile range, IQR). If the effect size is a median value the numbers in the brackets should represent an IQR.

* Table 3: the revised table is much more informative. However, it is not clear what weighted mean effect size is (in the study by Aubin et al), see comment above.
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