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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. Due to the expected low number of events, I suggest to use absolute differences instead of OR.
2. It should be clarified that if clinical or statistical heterogeneity is found, meta-analysis will not be done.
3. How will the authors combine outcomes to make a combined endpoint? Adding all outcomes? A yes/no alternative?
4. There are planned comparisons without RCTs? How do authors planned to deal with this?
5. How are you going to test publication bias?

**Minor Compulsory Revisions**

6. LILACS database should be included in the searching obeying to the lack of language restriction paragraph
7. Statistical analysis could be explained better (model, for example, was not specified)
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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