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Reviewer's report:

The qualitative synthesis included only 6 studies, a good range of studies is between 10 and 20. The search strategy was accurate but got have been expanded by setting a stage 1 and stage 2 criteria for the inclusion and exclusion of various types of studies pertaining to the given topic. The qualitative synthesis did not clearly differentiate between the First, Second and Third order constructs which is very important. The following paper is suggested as example to improve the methodology and revisiting the qualitative synthesis clearly differentiating between the first and second order constructs and third order interpretations.
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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.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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