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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 3: However, the statement that has been added as follows is difficult to understand. Could you please rewrite this?

"Regarding the scores for each question, score 1 was assigned to a positive answer to the index and score 0 to negative answers. Accordingly, the maximum quality score of 32 was considered, and papers with a score of less than 14 were considered to have low quality, and thus excluded from the study. In evaluating the articles through the STROBE criteria, only the appropriateness and grading of the writing of the articles have been considered for this criterion. No studies have been excluded from the quality assessment and so the quality score is considered as low as the study."

In particular, the last two sentences in the paragraph above are difficult to understand.

Respond: We evaluated the items of the STROBE checklist that were adequately reported. The total number of items on the STROBE checklist is 32. Some items are specific for some study designs only (e.g. cohort or case control). Consequently, if an item was not applicable for the study design, it was scored as ‘not applicable’. For a more detailed description of the requirements to score ‘adequately reported’, items were either scored as ‘adequately reported’ (score 1) or ‘not applicable’ (score 0). If any of these items were not applicable for the study design, it was scored as ‘not applicable’. ‘Not applicable’ items were not added to the amount of items to score. (The STROBE Statement was introduced to improve the quality of reporting of observational studies. The aim of the STROBE statement is to increase transparency in reporting. No studies have been excluded from the quality assessment.)

Reviewer 3: However, the statement that has been added as follows is difficult to understand. Could you please rewrite this? In addition, the flow diagram shows that 33 studies were excluded
"with reasons". The reviewer can't find where these 33 studies are listed and can't find the reasons for exclusion.

Respond: 33 articles whose complete contents were not accessible were removed (In the search for articles in Iranian sources, because most of these articles were outdated, the original text of the articles was not available to researchers, in addition most studies in the secondary assessment did not mention prevalence and thus 33 articles were excluded at this stage).

Reviewer 3: In Figures 3 and 4, the variable of interest is prevalence of obesity and this is a meta analysis of observational studies. The horizontal axis should not be labelled "favours A / favours B" because these labels are used for meta analyses of intervention studies.

Respond: Corrected