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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. I have read the paper with interest. Following you find my comments which will hopefully help improving the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions

I see a strong limitation of the study by including only the corresponding author. At least, the first and last authors are responsible for the results and conclusions of a systematic review and often the first and the last authors have differing professional roles.

One important aspect is the assignment of the professional role. Please describe why the current employment was used and not the affiliation information in the publications. In this review, publications from 2000 to 2015 have been included and it is very likely that affiliations have been changed for several authors.

Minor Essential Revisions

Methods

No established methodological framework for conducting systematic reviews is mentioned in the manuscript, e.g. the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Please describe which framework was used for this review.

Currently there is no subheading addressing the literature search, which is an important step in a systematic review. This aspect could be added to the subheading 'study selection'.

Please add a reason why only PubMed was searched. This should also be mentioned in the title of the review.

Screening and data extraction: Please state on which basis the four age categories for patients have been chosen (page 5, line 110).

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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