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Reviewer's report:

Authors have done an excellent job in responding to my peer-review and provided sufficient edits and additional information in the revised manuscript.

There is one issue that in my view remains to be better clarified, related to my second comment in the peer-review. This concerns the now well recognised need to perform assessment of quality of the body of evidence for patient-important outcomes in systematic reviews, as reflected in the Cochrane handbook. High quality systematic reviews now increasingly provide such evidence summaries (GRADE Summary of Findings tables) and these are extremely helpful for decision-makers, such as guideline developers (who in their absence have to make these from scratch). These evidence summaries are equally helpful for systematic reviewers interpreting the findings in their review. Authors could be more clear on how future living network meta-analysis could aid decision makers, by providing such evidence summaries. This could be communicated in their comment, my proposed additional text i bold below:

"Networks of trials and their synthesis through network meta-analysis could increase the value of research when treatment recommendations are based on an exhaustive up-to-date network of randomized evidence[72]. Guideline developers and other decision-makers may further benefit from network meta-analyses if these implement recent developments to rate the quality of the body of evidence supporting treatment effect estimates for all patient-important outcomes (e.g. GRADE Summary of Findings tables) and rankings from network meta-analysis."
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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