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Author’s response to reviews:

Our response to specific reviewer and editor comments

1) Methods: Data source -- Please mention your resource data sources (re-running of search terms)

Our response:

On page 5 we state:

'we re-ran their search terms (see Appendix 1) in the same six citation databases they used (namely: CINAHL (via EBSCO), MEDLINE, EMBASE and PsycINFO (all via Ovid), Sociological Abstracts (via ProQuest) and Cochrane CENTRAL)'.

We also provide in an appendix details of the search terms.

This level of detail conforms to the PRISMA statement.

2) Flow Diagram -- The authors should state precisely the reasons for excluding reports and their related number each time.

Our response: We have provided these details in Figure 1. This level of detail conforms to the PRISMA statement.

3) Results -- According to Table 1, the description of the comparator was not reported in 40 percent of studies in time 1 and 34 percent in time 2. Please modify the text accordingly.
Our response: This we have corrected.

4) Page 10, line 55: Put the 95% confidence interval in brackets.

Our response: This we have corrected.

Associate Editor

The discussion section can be shortened.

Our response: we have shortened this section.