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Author’s response to reviews:
Associate Editor:

As there seems to be a certain discrepancy in the interpretation of the term "systematic review" I hope the following solution can be agreed upon:

Specify in your manuscript, that this is a systematic literature Review, but not a meta-analysis and make sure to differentiate between the two terms in the entire manuscript: e.g. it should be "systematic reviews with meta-Analysis" in the following part:

"The randomised clinical trial is the study design reaching the highest level of evidence when assessing the benefits and harms of any given intervention, only surpassed 180 by systematic reviews of all available RCTs (5)."

The absence of a meta-analysis should also be discussed in the limitations of this article.

>>We thank the Associate Editor for his suggestions. We have made several changes and hope that the reviewer and Associate Editor will agree to these.