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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have considerably improved the manuscript based on the comments. However, there is still room for improvement to have a high quality article. Here are my comments:

- In the Introduction section:

Unfortunately, the authors’ explanation regarding "well designed studies" will not provide enough reasoning to use this term. We have many RCT studies that have not been well designed and in addition, the RCT studies have low/hi qualities as mentioned by Chung et al. (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3429837/). Therefore, the definition of "well-designed studies" is still not clear.

- Methods:

It seems the authors misunderstood my comments regarding the inclusion/ exclusion criteria. What I meant was to present them in a table instead of text (not both). In addition, regarding the search queries, I've appreciated the authors comment. However, since the search queries might be too much to present in the manuscript, my suggestion would be to add it a supplement file instead (similar to the example in the manuscript) to help the manuscript's reliability and reproducibility.

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal