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Reviewer’s report:

1. The background section of the abstract is unclear in places (e.g. pg 2 line 5 - it is not clear what 'it' refers to in the sentences: '… it is more physiological…' and '… although it is known…'

2. It may be useful to also mention study selection in the abstract to cover the screening stage of the systematic review, because it currently gives the impression that data extraction will follow the searches (pg 2 lines 15-17).

3. Aims and objectives - '… respond to such violence global scale and evaluate its effectiveness.' (pg 2 lines 6-7). It is not immediately clear what this means, or what 'its' refers to so you may need to restructure this.

4. Methods - it is not clear what '… including stripping reason …' (pg 4 line 28) means here.

5. Methods (pg 5) - you need to justify restricting inclusion to studies published from 1990 onward.

6. Methods (pg 5) - what do you mean by 'studies whose full text can be accessed'? For transparency, you need to describe what levels of access you will/hope to have.

7. Methods (pg 5 & 6) - you state that for objective 2, you will include 'laws, regulations and government intervention programs' but limit inclusion to meeting 'quality criteria according to STROBE'. You need to describe the ways that you will assess the quality of the other types of literature that are not observational studies (especially grey literature).

8. Methods (pg 7 line 8) - studies will be 'compared confronted with each other' - what does this mean?

9. Methods (pg 8) - under 'evaluating the reliability of results' you list both AMSTAR and PRISMA-P as the standards that the systematic review will follow. However, these two tools are not designed for the same purpose, as PRISMA-P is applicable to protocols. The PRISMA (not PRISMA-P) checklist is better suited for this purpose.
10. Data synthesis (pg 7) - you need to define what you mean by heterogeneity being significant (i.e. what the threshold will be applied for significance). The sentence in lines 48 and 49: '…if heterogeneity…will be used.' is also not clear. It would also be useful for you to describe more clearly how you will synthesise the data if there is significant heterogeneity (subject to how you will define this).

11. Data synthesis (pg 7 line 49) it might be useful to justify (in some more detail), the use of a random effects model.

12. The format used in the References section does not all appear to match - there are missing details such as page numbers, access dates. There is also a lack of consistency in the way the metadata are presented {e.g. year of publication in brackets (pg 11 line 4) vs standalone (pg 11 line 16)}. You need to select the format that is accepted by the journal (the BioMed Central reference style) and use it for all the references.
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