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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed most of my comments in a satisfactory manner and the manuscript is much improved and clearer. However, several key methodological elements are still missing. While the accuracy of the writing is much improved, several grammar errors remain, most notably lack of agreement between subject and predicate in several places (I indicated a few of these).

Abstract:

First sentence: psychiatric disorders "are" a growing public health concern (not "is")

Background

P.3, Line 16 and line 17: "has" instead of "have"

P.4, Line 11-12: What is the review report? The authors need to give the reference

P.4, Line 12: "are" instead of "is"

P.4 Line 21: "optimal" instead of "optimum"

P.4 Line 25-26: replace concise evidence with "systematic reviews and meta-analyses"

Method:

P5, L.16: removed "composed"

I still do not understand at all how the authors will assess quality. The reference cited is a meta-analysis in depression; how will that be used? The authors need to include an instrument to rate the INDIVIDUAL studies and that needs to have been developed for observational research.
The authors give a tool in Appendix 4 and they refer to it further in the Method. How was that tool constructed? Has it been used before and its properties (reliability, validity) tested? Have the authors created it? The authors should search for an already existent and studied tool for assessing the quality of observational research. There are several such tools: see for instance https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20728045 (a systematic reviews of such tools). It is very counterproductive for the authors to develop their own tool, combining and adapting others, because then we really do not know what this new instrument measures, it has not been studied independently, some items might be relevant, and others not etc

P.6, l.28-29: If that is an exclusion criteria it should be moved at the description of eligibility criteria.

P.6: The authors should just use the PRISMA as reporting tool (and appendix 3 needs to be modified to follow the PRISMA). Adapting various guidelines and combining them is a misleading approach to take.

The authors then state they will use the MOOSE guideline, which is a PRISMA proposal extension for observational research. The authors need to clarify, they cannot simply combine reporting guidelines. In order for the results to be comparable, it need to be clear what reporting guideline they will use.

Also, will the abstracts be kept separated and used separately or combined with the other studies?

The authors still do not give any information about the effect size (ES) measure. As I said before, the authors need to say what quantitative data will be extracted (e.g., counts, rates, correlation coefficients) and what indicators will be derived from these (odds ratios, risk ratios etc).

P.7, line 9-11: this part refers to the search and should be moved there. At this section, the authors should detail (or at least give some examples) of what information they will extract from the papers (e.g., type of sample, setting, conditions, etc). They also need to explain how will they study determinants/predictors (combine them in categories? What categories? What basis will they use for constructing these categories?)
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