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Reviewer's report:

Specific comments

- In the abstract, provide the name of the registry apart from the registration number as required in the PRISMA checklist item number 2.

- On names of authors, do not include mailing addresses for affiliations, rather, include mailing address for the corresponding author only in the contacts as you have done.

- Citation style in lines 77-78 is not appropriate. I suggest removing the rest from the parentheses and leave only the web link therein.

- PICOS in lines 79-80 is very weak and incomplete. I suggest rephrasing it to clearly include all aspects of PICOS to satisfy item 7 of the PRISMA guidelines

- In lines 93-95, specify an intervention or interventions that this particular research will focus on. As it is, there is lack of transparency, giving room to shifting from intervention to intervention during the study period.

- In line 97, did you mean "...will not be included"? Please check on that
- Lines 39-40 in the abstract appear to be contradicting lines 96-98. I suggest redoing these by streamlining what you exactly plan on doing.

- In lines 101-103, how are you planning on accessing peer reviewed but non-indexed articles? Also, state the time frame of publications of interest. Is it those published between 2010 and 2019? Be clear on this.

- For section 2.3, state what database you used for a reviewer to immediately dry test the string. I only presumed it was PubMed but I could be wrong.

- The search strategy is also weak in encompassing all PICO items. It is only focusing on 2 items in my view.

- In section 2.5, it is important to identify the investigators who will do the search, resolve disagreements and all other tasks to avoid a situation where everyone is waiting for someone else to act (Personalize these tasks).

- It is imperative to describe data synthesis in details. That is lacking in this protocol. I suggest including them herein.

General:

- English language needs thorough revision in the entire text.

**Level of interest**

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field that should be highlighted to relevant networks.

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published.
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