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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract:

Results of the abstract showed "two" studies had a high methodological quality. This was wrong based on the text and Table 1. It should change as "three" studies. Otherwise, writing was clear and organized with meaningful background and aim.

Background:

The context of background was fluent and organized with importance, known and unknown body of knowledge, and three aims for this systematic review.

Methods:

The manuscript includes all information of methods using systematic review, but headings of methods have to revise as search and screening strategy, study selection, assessment of study quality, data extraction, and methods of synthesis.

Results:

Please change T0 as T1, T1 as T2, T2 as T3, and T4 as T5 according to the conception of Campbell & Stanley (1963) in Table 1.

Discussion:

The context of discussion was fluent and organized with interpretation for findings.

Conclusions:

The conclusions was clear and objective.

Citations and references:

1. Please delete coma after last name of the first author in the whole text and Table 1. e.g., Cook, et al. 2014
2. The manuscript has a lack of volume, issue, and "doi" in many references and has underline on website address (1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11-14, 16-20, 22-25, 27-33, 36-38, 40-47, 49-52, 55, & 57). Please check style of references carefully again for meeting the author guideline.

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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