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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Line 138 – data is a plural so this should be "data were abstracted."

-- Author response: Thank you. We have made the suggested change [Line 129].

2. Please reduce repetition in the methods and results regarding the results of the search strategy e.g. focus on how many studies the search yielded and subsequent exclusions in the results section only

-- Author response: Thank you, and we have made the suggested change. We have moved information on the search strategy and inclusion/exclusion to the results section, and removed it from the methods [Lines 168-176].

3. Line 266 – spell out 62% at the start of the sentence e.g. Sixty-two percent...

-- Author response: Thank you. We have made the suggested change [Line 299].

4. In the results section, please briefly summarise the findings of the quality assessment, rather than commenting on quality for the first time in the discussion.

-- Author response: Thank you. We have briefly summarized the quality assessments findings in the results section, both under medical relevance [Lines 250-257] and under impact on examinee [Lines 324-328].

5. Please also re-check the manuscript thoroughly (including the tables) for any grammatical, typographical or data abstraction errors.

-- Author response: Thank you. We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript and tables for errors. We have made minor changes to the formatting of Tables 1a and 1b.