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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewer 2s (response from reviewer 1, have already been made):

Line 9: There should be a chart of data collection process where the data collection process is explained rather than in a narrative. All this information “(eg, author names, year of publication, country of study, study design, sample size)” described in the chart will present the information more vividly. A chart/picture is what more than a thousand words.

Answer: A table explaining the whole process of data collection, as informed by the reviewer, was inserted in the text.

Line 28: should report on why this design is most suited for the review and the benefit the review would have to the community of practice.

Answer: As reported by the reviewer, an explanation of the design and its suitability for review and the benefits to the practice community have been inserted in the text

At line 43: there should be a Chart showing the Flow of information through the different phases of a systematic review. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100.g001.
This should show numbers of identified records, excluded articles, and included studies and after revisions the group approved should be shown in the checklist, flow diagram, and in this explanatory paper, such that it can be repeated by an independent researcher.

Answer: A table was inserted in the text to explain the information flow of the different phases of the systematic review, as reported by the reviewer.

Line 44: At the eligibility criteria, it is good to differentiate the inclusion and exclusion criteria by stating the study characteristics using the PICOS, as well as the report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review in each section.

Answer: In the text in the eligibility criteria phase, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were differentiated according to the suggested by the reviewer.

Line 32 – 41, describes the method of the protocol as taking after the Cochrane methodology while the article of the systematic review will take another framework – PRISMA – Protocol. But, for systematic reviews and meta-analysis, PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist is recommended and not the statement. The copy of which is held by PRISMA – P group and distributed by the Creative commons attribution licence 4.0.

Answer: Changes were made as recommended by the reviewer, refreo protocol method.

Line 10 -11 states evaluation of the evidence of publication bias though not stating how such as GRADE which helps us to know the strength of the body of the evidence assessed.

Answer: The form of evaluation of the evidence of publication bias through GRADE has been inserted in the text.

All answers are marked in the text, as well as the details that have been reviewed and suggested.