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 Dear Dr Kelly,

Thank you for considering our manuscript SYSR-D-19-00227 entitled “An overview of systematic reviews of complementary and alternative therapies for infantile colic” by Perry et al. and for the very helpful feedback from the reviewer and the editorial team.

We have revised our manuscript in line with the reviewer’s comments and the requests from the editorial team and would be grateful for further consideration of our enclosed revised documents.

I also reconfirm that this manuscript has not been submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere, and all authors have read and approved the final manuscript and agree with its re-submission to Systematic Reviews.

Many thanks and we look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Rachel Perry
Thank you very much for your helpful comments – I have hopefully addressed them all below. I have also highlighted in the resubmitted version of the paper where the changes have taken place.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #2: General comments

* This study provides overview of systematic reviews conducted complementary therapies in the treatment of infantile colic. The study summarized the studies so that the needy can use for decision making and has crucial importance in the field of study. However, the research methodology should be described in such way that other research could duplicate the result by following the same procedure in that there is no search terminology (keywords and syntax) presented in this study.

This information is in Appendix 3 (supplementary material) as we felt it would be too large for the main paper.

Minor comments

* Correct the second sentence of the abstract; delete the first 'was'. Revise the whole sentence

Thank you for spotting this error - I have removed “was” from the sentence

* Page 5 line 6; is that '5% and 20%' or '5% to 20%'?

Thank you for spotting this - I have changed this to “5% to 20%”

* Page 6 lines 29-34; "Three were from the UK and Australia, two from Poland and one each from France, Mexico, Canada, Norway, Germany, Saudi Arabia, China and USA." Are these countries where the authors are based or else all the articles included in the systematic review are coming? The importance of the sentence is somewhat blurred.

I have added the following sentence for clarity:

The reviews were conducted from the following countries:

Additional editorial comments:

Thank you for submitting your work to Systematic Reviews.
In addition to the comments from reviewer 2,

Please detail further your data extraction section. What data would you extract from the studies, rather than simply referring to table 1.

This paragraph was originally in Appendix 3 – but I can appreciate it is better placed in the main text.

Information was extracted on author, date of review, country, list of studies included in the individual review, intervention and comparator summary, number of participants, diagnosis criteria, meta-analysis results or summary of main between-group results, whether a sensitivity or subgroup analysis was conducted, risk of bias assessment and adverse events.

Please detail how Google Scholar was used as a data source. It is not clear if you mean it was used for grey literature.

Thank you for pointing this out: I have now amended the sections referring to the searches.

I have made a few other changes for clarity:

P20.

Line 13

Harb et al [24] conducted a subgroup meta-analysis focussing only on extracts containing fennel and demonstrated it to be effective for reducing colic symptoms in solely breast-fed infants.

Line 33

Perry et al [22] and Bruyas-Bertholon et al [23] both reported results that demonstrated fennel herbal extracts to be effective in reducing colic symptoms, but both concluded that the methodological issues of the individual studies (discussed above) call these results into question.