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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Answer to the comments and suggestions of Reviewer 1

Congratulations on the detailed and extensive revisions to this paper, which has been an enormous amount of work. It now presents a comprehensive, well-structured and well-interpreted mapping of the evidence on health outcomes possibly associated with NNS intake, that is aligned with the main aim of the paper. I commend the authors for examining such a vast body of literature and producing a useful product that can highlights gaps, and can inform syntheses, primary studies and decision-making.

A few grammatical and sentence structure corrections remain.

We thank the reviewer for accepting our revised paper.

We asked a colleague not involved in the work, but fluent in English to review our manuscript for remaining mistakes in English usage.

Answer to the comments of Reviewer 3

Thank you for the Reviewer for further improving the presentation of our review.

1. I am satisfied that you have addressed the previous reviewer comments. However, more references need to be added to results. For example: Headaches results paragraph: "Two of them (one RCT and one cohort study) described a significant positive association, in the others no significant association was found between AS consumption and headaches." still requires referencing. Please check the entire results section to ensure that the referencing of studies is consistent and comprehensive.

We checked the Results section for proper referencing again, and added missing references.
2. Suggest more formal language in the abstract: E.g."Numerous health outcomes including headaches, behavioural and cognitive effects, neurological effects, risk of preterm delivery, cardiovascular effects or risk of kidney disease were investigated in fewer studies and further research is required."

We revised this sentence.

3. Suggest revision of "To get a comprehensive overview", "and points out the"

We revised these expressions, as suggested by the Reviewer.

4. Please define "primary studies" at first mention.

We added the following definition for primary studies: “studies that collect original data from subjects”.

5. Inclusion criteria for the population - were there any age restrictions, or health or disease state requirements?

No restrictions were made to the population. We supplemented inclusion criteria for the population with this information: “a study on human beings (of any age, gender or health status)”

6. L30, P10 Sentence "In this manuscripts we report on relevant systematic reviews, clinical trials, cohort studies, case-control and cross-sectional studies." would be better placed in the methods, not results.

We transferred the mentioned sentence to the Methods section.