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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written paper of significant importance to researchers and practitioners. A few comments for improvement:

Typo in the methods section, it says three papers but there are four references.

There is a redundancy in the presentation of the results. E.g. on page 9, under Interventions study characteristics there is text that is repeated in forthcoming parts of the Results section. Please check throughout.

Table 2 needs extensive revision. The column headings are difficult to understand and more information is necessary to facilitate the reading. Maybe footnotes with variable descriptions could help? Cross-referencing to reference number in the text is necessary, as is done in table 1. Also in table 1 column headings need clarification. Consider footnotes?

Study limitations: The paper would benefit from a more thorough description of the limitations of the study. For example, did the use of the EPOC criteria provide an unnecessary restricted sample of studies to include in the review? Could this kind of review benefit from a applying a broader perspective in this sense?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
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