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Reviewer's report:

There are some weaknesses in the methodology that should be resolved:

- Authors should revise their manuscript with the help of the PRISMA guidelines. It could definitely improve the quality of the reporting.

- The study design should be one of the inclusion/exclusion criteria.

- Authors should report the date limit of their search.

- Authors did not perform any research in the grey literature. They should discuss about this weakness in the discussion.

- It appears that authors did not perform a manual search in the bibliography of relevant studies. They should discuss about this weakness in the discussion.

- Complete search strategy could be provided as an additional table.

- The last sentence of the « data sources and search strategy » part is already a result. Please move this sentence to the results and give some information based on the flowchart.

- No information is given about the number of authors that performed the study selection. According to PRISMA guidelines, study selection (both rounds of title and abstract and full-text review) should be performed by two independent reviewers. This is also valuable for data extraction.

- The assessment of quality of individual studies is not clear. Authors should use published and validated tool designed to assess quality of cross sectional studies. Moreover, sensitivity analyses should be performed according to cut-offs of quality.

- It is not clear how authors defined their subgroups (by using the median value? By personal choice?, etc.)
- Table 2 is not clear at all. How could authors get pooled prevalence for individual studies?

- Assessing risk factors and drug resistance are not announced as objectives of the study. It is quite surprising to present these results with subtitles. Maybe these results should be given in the first part of the results, as a characteristic of included studies.

- Authors did not compute a p-value between groups for their different subgroups. Still regarding these subgroups, it is not clear why a forest plot has only been dressed for microscopy.

**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:

Acceptable

**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

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world’s journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

Yes