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Reviewer's report:

The paper compares the different available prokinetics available for the treatment of FD using meta-analysis. Although the paper clearly describes the difference in effectiveness between the prokinetics, some aspects could be improved.

Abstract:

- Use the abbreviation of FD
- Full description of RCT is missing
- Include p-values to state significance

Background:

- Background description is too short
- The authors claim that FD occurs in 30-40% of the population, while in the paper they refer to the prevalence is much lower, please explain
- Symptom description according to Rome III is missing, also a general description of FD should be included together with the two subtypes of FD
- An introduction of the different prokinetics is missing

Methods:

- If there was no language restriction, how where the papers in Chinese and Portugues interpreted
- How was significance determined for the ORs?
Results:
- Reference 36 in the text on line 190 has the wrong configuration
- p-values of the ORs are missing
- Values of fig 3 and table 3 are different, though they represent the same data
- I have the feeling that there is a lot of overlap between the figures and the tables. The authors should decide with figures or tables would best represent the data and eliminate recurring data.

Figures:
- The resolution is too low
- Legends need to contain more information

Table 1:
- Also include the gender and age distribution for each study
- What were the adverse events per study if present and the dosages/administration route of the prokinetics
- What is meant by the effective vs total, please explain as no further explanation is given in the text

Discussion:
- It has been described that FD patients have impaired accommodation. Could it be that the lack of symptomatic relief after prokinetics could be due to a negative effect on gastric accommodation?

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.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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