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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written paper.

1. Further clarity is required regarding the title and the actual paper. The title suggests this is a meta-analysis literature review but it the analysis that uses meta-analysis. The study excludes systematic literature reviews. It is a review of RCTs.

2. Revise the introductory literature to be more comprehensive, concise and on-topic in terms of VR.

3. Line 13 consider replacing "normal" with functional capacity or another term.

4. Start with a clear and concise introduction that explains the purpose of the article and plan.

5. Revise the method to follow the process undertaken from the beginning to end stages ie. study question and search terms come before data searches.

6. Line 53- provide specific search information rather than "such as".

7. Was there a control for face to face comparisons in the RCTs? If not it is not possible to compare face-to-face and VR outcomes. Please elaborate on the study design. In the Discussion and Conclusion it is suggested that VR is more successful than individual or groupwork but this does not seem to be supported by the study findings. Please clarify and elaborate. Increased explanatory sentences throughout would be helpful.

8. Far more detail is required on the screening process if following PRISMA guidelines for Title, Abstract and full paper and process of review.

9. I cannot assess the statistical review and will rely on other reviewers for this.

10. Relate the conclusions to your study findings only and avoid unsubstantiated claims.
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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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