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Reviewer's report:

This is an important and well-written paper that outlines meaningful and useful findings from existing literature on pets and mental health. The methods are rigorous. I have only a few minor edits and comments for improving the overall manuscript.

General: there seem to be many missing commas throughout. Some of this may be a stylistic choice, but oftentimes commas were also missing from necessary locations, such as lists.

Background:

Line 125: I think this should be providing "companionship" not "companionships."

Theoretical framework: While interesting, I think the theoretical framework piece needs to be more directly tied to the current manuscript. As it stands now, I'm not sure how this theoretical framework is useful in this context nor how it is being applied, specifically, to this review.

Methods:

Line 180: "Table 1" should be capitalized in-text.

Lines 204: Numbering needs commas. Also, should it be "participant's" or "participants'" perspectives?

Line 214: I think "components" should be "component."

Lines 228-233: How were exclusion/inclusion conflicts resolved? Were additional articles identified by referring to reference lists? (I can see in the figure that they were; should probably be mentioned in-text).

Line 435: "effected" should be "affected."
Line 442: "Pets" should be "Pets'" (with an apostrophe).

Line 696: "Nourishment" is misspelled.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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