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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very well-written manuscript I believe it is acceptable for publication in its current form. The authors might consider the following optional revision to enhance the manuscript.

The review of the literature appears to be comprehensive but falls short of the standards of a systematic review. Your manuscript would be much stronger if you took the steps to make this a systematic review rather than a narrative review. There are several similar case study and narrative review papers in the literature. Conducting a systematic review would conform to current standards of evidence, distinguish your paper from previous narrative reviews, and provide a stronger contribution to the field. As it stands, your paper is a very nicely written case study and review, but the contribution is unclear.

The problem with narrative reviews is that the reader has no way of knowing whether the review as systematically gathered the evidence. It is possible that one author based their review on one set of studies and another author based their review on a different set of studies. Thus, although it may be unintentional, there is an inherent risk of bias in narrative reviews. For that reason, they are considered low-quality evidence. In contrast, a systematic review enables a reader to evaluate the process that was used to gather evidence and provides assurance that the review was comprehensive. My sense is that your team conducted a very thorough review; however, there is no way for me to evaluate your review because you did not describe the process you used to gather evidence. My guess is that it would not take a lot of work to turn this into a systematic review which would be considered higher-quality evidence than a narrative review.

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.

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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