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Reviewer's report:

This paper is clearly written and the findings are well presented. However, more information about the methodology is required.

First the type of review needs to be explained and referenced. This paper would not meet the definition of a systematic review as provided by the Cochrane Consumer Network for example (see http://consumers.cochrane.org/what-systematic-review).

Second, date inclusion criteria need to be provided, and the related rationale, or it needs to be stated that there were no exclusions by date.

Third the quality rating method needs to be further explained and justified. In particular, the use of a qualitative research evaluation tool to determine the quality of quantitative and/or mixed methods research appears (at least without this further explanation) to be inappropriate. Similarly, the use of thematic synthesis requires further explanation within this context. The authors state that findings from an RCT significantly influence findings of the review. Therefore, these are particularly critical issues.

Fourth, the criteria used to grade papers as of high, moderate, or low quality - and how contributions to the synthesis of individual studies were determined to be small, medium, or large - also need to be explained.

Finally, when strengths and weaknesses of the review are outlined, the generalisability of findings of included studies is addressed but not the transferability, which would have been more appropriate for the qualitative work.

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.

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
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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