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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your revision. Some outstanding corrections are required:
- Define PEO in the abstract - or rather avoid abbreviations.
- GRADE is not mentioned in the abstract.
- Date of search is missing in the abstract.
- Women are of reproductive age less than 18 years; do you mean adult women of reproductive age?
- Your response to comments states multiple times that you used GRADE...but GRADE is not mentioned in the methods anywhere. GRADE deserves its own heading. If the authors need professional development to use GRADE, I refer them to: https://cebgrade.mcmaster.ca/ and https://gradepro.org/. GRADEpro website has the GRADE handbook and free software to implement the evaluation system.
- Why is ROBINS-I first summarised in the meta analysis methods section and not in the quality evaluation?
- When reporting results in text; you refer to "diet quality" even when discussing findings/studies which didn't evaluate diet quality as highlighted by the Assistant Editor. Those studies which only measured dietary intake should be excluded from meta-analyses and results reported separately and not combined with studies which answer the research question (i.e. studies that measured diet quality).
- Move findings from the quality assessment, recruitment procedure, exposure, and dietary assessment, higher, all before "findings" of the studies" subheading.
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