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Reviewer's report:

Thank you to all the authors for the opportunity to review this interesting protocol.

1. 156 - One of the systematic reviews you cite, Cho, Y et al from 2014 was recently updated in October 2018. How does this impact your protocol? I suggest you mention the review was recently updated; if it doesn't impact the rationale behind your protocol, it can only strengthen the case for your review; if it does, you must address it.

2. 171. The authors have indicated they have prepared the protocol using PRISMA-P, but they haven't mentioned the methods in which they will conduct the study, or the reporting guideline (PRISMA) they'll use to report the review. Are you using the Cochrane Handbook? York CRD's? I suggest the authors indicate this in their protocol.

3. 187 - 209. Great job in identifying a comprehensive list of sources. I suggest the authors document all searches, with the date, interface, and exact search terms entered, especially given you will search via interfaces that can be unstable at times. CADTH's Grey Matters Tool can be of help to guide the structure on how searches, particularly for some of these sources should be documented; definitely their grey literature sources. https://www.cadth.ca/resources/finding-evidence/grey-matters

4. 224-225 - Are you double checking results to ascertain that these publication types (commentaries, letters, editorials) are the only ones being excluded from the search?

5. 226 - A data management plan should oversee all the information gathered, analysed, and presented in this study. I suggest the authors consider having a data management plan (DMP). Guidance can be sought out from their in-house resources through their institutions, or via freely available structures such as: https://dmptool.org/

I'm looking forward to reading the reviewed version of this protocol, and the final review. Best of luck!
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