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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your courteous attention to comments. It seems adequate revisions have been made to the manuscript to address most points. I still have one query with regards to comment R3.6 in which I questioned the statement regarding citations being included if included by at least one reviewer as erroneous. The authors' response was to clarify that any citation included by either reviewer will be included without any discussion, even if one reviewer excluded it. From a reviewer point of view, this seems problematic because there will always be studies that need to be looked at more closely and subsequently excluded. If you include everything and never question it's inclusion/eligibility not only will you end with some irrelevant or useless studies but none of the reviewers will learn anything from the process of screening/study selection which I think was the entire point of have 7 team members divide the task of double screening between them? But if this is a process which takes place without any reflection or reflexivity I would question the value of this conservative approach. If reviewers are working independently, without consensus, it will be inconsistent and unlikely to benefit from double screening.
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