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**Reviewer’s report:**

1. Please clarify type of study in the result section of abstract.

2. Please include the dates of coverage and date last searched

3. Search terms in Ovid Medline and Embase are different. Please attach search terms that were used in each database as supplement for Data source and search strategies in the manuscript.

4. It will be better to show kappa for the selection and data extraction. Please show the data of kappa of agreement during the systematic searches. How disagreements were solved during the systematic search among two independent reviewers?

5. Heterogeneity I2 needs to be included in the result sections.

6. Authors should discuss the reason of heterogeneity (figure 5-8).

7. Figure1, suggest to use PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram platform

8. There are many errors on citations. "Error! Bookmark not defined" Please fix all references and citation issues.

9. Please clarify why Fix effect was used, when there is significant heterogeneity (figure 5-8).

10. Some revision of the english language is needed. There are some parts of the paper where it is quite difficult to make sense of some sentences English edit will help to improve the quality of the manuscript.

"which in may turn trigger over consumption" is incorrect in grammar.

"over consumption" should be "overconsumption"

"These allowed us to identity and review the influence of the studies with risk of bias" "identity" is misused.

"three factor eating questionnaire" "three factor" should be "three-factor"
Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Were you mentored through this peer review?
No