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Reviewer’s report:

Authors have well written the protocol however, following minor points should be addressed to improve the quality of their manuscript:

1. There is no mention of searching unpublished research or the grey literature e.g., government reports, that also contributing to potential missing out on relevant and important data to include.

2. Authors have mentioned that in case of missing outcome data, the primary study authors will be contacted. However, it is not clear that what mode of contact will be used and how many times.

3. In case of using non-validated tools, it may be considered as other risk of bias while assessing RoB. It may also be considered for in subgroup analysis (i.e., validated vs. non-validated) of substantial number of studies are available.

4. Authors should also report about publication bias separately in a subheading. Here, you can describe about funnel (of course, if number of studies allowed to do so) plot and its asymmetry tests.

5. There is no mention about the influence and outlier analysis in protocol. A priori statement may be useful if applicable during the analysis.

6. It also desirable to mention about the agreement analysis (such as kappa statistic) between the two reviewers who mainly involved in the data collection.

7. Line 240-241, forest plots are also used to demonstrate the effect sizes (individual or pooled). So, need to correct this sentence.
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