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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Editor Comments:

1. In order to be in line with journal requirements, please include the following headings within your manuscript: Background, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions

The heading ‘introduction’ has been changed to ‘background’. All other subheadings were included in the original manuscript.

2. We strongly encourage all authors to share their raw data, either by providing it in a supplementary file or depositing it in a public repository and providing the details on how to access it in this section.

Since this is a systematic review, we included the statement:

‘All data analysed during this study are included in the reviewed studies’.
Justification: We do not hold a dataset with raw data from the included studies. Researchers requiring access to this data from the individual included studies would need to contact the original authors of those studies. However, summary data generated by this review is provided in Tables within this manuscript.

3. We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of CG as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to editing the manuscript alone does not usually justify authorship.

The text has been amended as follows:

Authors’ contributions

EK and HB conceived of the study. EK drafted the review protocol, conducted all article search and screening processes, extracted data for review and contributed to all drafts of the manuscript. HQ acted as second reviewer for later screening processes, and HB contributed to the study protocol and resolved disagreements between reviewers. TR analysed the clinical significance of all findings. All authors (EK, HB, HQ, TR, CG) contributed to interpretation of data, edited each draft of the manuscript and approved the final version.