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thank you for reporting this frenotomy is an epidemic not backed up by evidence it is a bit like the new thing since sliced bread well done!

Dear Authors

This is a very exhaustive systematic research and meta-analysis, probably the best, up to now on this drug. The methodology has been adequately followed all along the work. I just have a regret: As this result originates from several treatments, we are in the particular well known configuration of multiple treatment comparison, further more with partially reported endpoints. This is an exciting area of meta-analysis treated, for instance by Network meta-analysis. I understand that this new analysis should be very long and costly, thus I don't ask for revision for this. However, It should be a limitations, and I would recommend you to mention this, in saying that MTC should be approached with a more adapted Stat technique.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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