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The authors have substantially revised the review paper, and are commended for their responsiveness to feedback and for extending the review to include studies published while the manuscript was under review. Overall, the revisions have led to a much stronger review, with a clearer focus and more transparent review process.

Thank you for this review and feedback. New edits highlighted in blue in the manuscript

A few issues remain:

1) A minor point, but a stronger rationale could be made for focusing on psychiatric disorders (as opposed to pain or other disorders with applications for medicinal cannabis products). Authors state no such review exists, but beyond being novel, what is the scientific/clinical rationale for focusing on these disorders?

In essence, the lead author is a psychiatry-focused researcher- thus the specific interest in this area. Additionally, this submission is for a special issue in BMC Psychiatry on cannabis.
However, we have now added an additional reason underpinning why we conducted this review specifically on psychiatric disorders. And added a supporting reference.

‘A further motive for this paper focusing solely on psychiatric disorders, concerns cannabis users noting that self-reported anxiety, insomnia, and depression symptoms are amongst the most common reasons for usage (34).’

2) on page 5, "though beneficial" should either have an accompanying citation or be removed.

Now removed

3) page 6, the sentence ending in "sterile systematic review" makes the purpose of the review less clear. The updated reporting of the review procedures is a strength (e.g., becoming more systematic), and it is unclear how being systematic makes a review "sterile" and further, how a systematic review is less clinically relevant. Perhaps stating that the review of the extant literature will inform discussion of clinical context and recommendations could communicate the intent of the review.

We have now removed the word ‘sterile’ from this sentence so as to not confuse the focus, and added in your suggested passage:

‘Our intention was to provide a review of the extant literature to inform a discussion with clinical context and appropriate recommendations.’

4) p15, the section beginning "several academics" requires citations.

We have now placed in some references to support this statement. See Refs 91-95.