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Reviewer's report:

This systematic review protocol is now very much improved from the previous two versions. Most of the issues I have raised are now addressed. There is one more point I strongly insist the authors to work on. The quality assessment tool is not appropriate. The authors mentioned they will use STROBE to assess the quality of the studies. STROBE is not a quality assessment tool. It is a reporting checklist for observational studies. STROBE is a PRISMA equivalent for observational studies. The authors have to choose a suitable tool. Let me suggest some appropriate quality assessment tools. You may choose one of them.

1. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (cited nearly 8500 times)  
   http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp


3. You can also use the Risk of Bias in non-Randomized studies of interventions (ROBINS-I) tool to assess Risk of Bias in any non-RCT http://methods.cochrane.org/bias/risk-bias-non-randomized-studies-interventions

Using tools such as Covidence (endorsed by Cochrane) can help systematic review authors automate the systematic review process. Try to visit the Sys Rev tool box for more helpful softwares.
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