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Reviewer’s report:

The current study focuses on a very important research area of concern. The authors have done a really great job detailing about various aspects of conducting a systematic review with meta-analysis. The presented figures and tables are well prepared and are appropriate for this type of research. Another strength of the study is elaboration that has been provided about the bias analysis.

Please find below some comments and questions about the manuscript:

1) It would be good if the article selection criteria are stated in bullets points or as a numbered list.

2) It is unclear, if the inclusion criteria only applied certain types of study designs or all study designs. If the inclusion criteria were not specific for particular study designs to be included, how did the authors make sure that the results from different study designs could be compared? Some elaboration on this would be good.

3) Line 132 states that an unpublished protocol contains the study inclusion criteria, was this protocol a standard one?

4) In the methods section, a short data extraction sub-section could be included that details upon what kind of data were extracted. Similarly, a sub-section for the analysis used should be elaborated here itself to help the readers follow.

5) Line 154 states that search were conducted up to April 23, 2015; however, later it is stated that search began on March 31st 2012. Please make sure both match.

6) In line 269, how was the internal validity score of at least 50% decided upon as to accept the methodological quality of the study and how 66% was chosen as criteria for high quality (authors' agreement?)? Please quote if there is any evidence from previous literature about this.

7) Last column of Table 1 states that sources of error (bias?) are included along with confounders, however; none such source has been identified.
8) General comment for the entire manuscript: some sections (like introduction and methods) could be cut down by a few words to somewhat reduce the overall length of the manuscript?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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.
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