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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

I just have a few minor suggestions that the authors may wish to consider;

1. In the 'Studies included for the review' section (lines 155-157), to include your reasons for incorporating a range of study designs. Randomised controlled trials are usually considered the 'Gold standard', however presumably here you are not expecting to find sufficient studies on this topic to limit the search to RCT's only. I would state this rationale, even if it appears obvious to the authors, as some systematic review assessment tools (e.g. AMSTAR-II checklist) have this as a quality check criteria.

2. Further to the above, you perform a quality assessment of your included studies using the McMaster critical appraisal tool. I would link your findings from this into your descriptive summary to make it clear to the readers, which likely will include clinicians and practitioners, which of your included outcomes are supported by the higher quality evidence. For example, I would emphasis in the text that both of your included RCT's support the safety of urea for the treatment of onychomycosis with one further supporting its efficacy, especially given that you have very limited data on this outcome.
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