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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author’s interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Response adequate: Thank you for reviewing the comments from my previous review. Whilst the authors have responded to each of the comments addressed I still feel that the research question could be more adequately answered with a IPD analysis. The authors suggest that this is not in the public domain. However, in systematic review terms, data can be requested from authors to undertaken IPD analyses (as happens in reality) and therefore becomes available if requested. I therefore suggest that if the authors choose not to do this, and the editorial team feel that there is sufficient information in this publication to accept the paper, then the use of a IPD analysis is documented in the Discussion section either as a limitation or as a future research suggestion. This would be beneficial.

Have changes been made: The authors have made a number of changes from Reviewer 1 and 2. However, I would suggest that these (particularly Reviewer 2's (mine)) have not been adequately reflected in this revised paper and further comments as limitations would be beneficial.

Overall impression: The paper is an improvement from the first version but I would still question how useful this paper is compared to attempting to answer this question with a larger dataset (i.e. IPD analysis). Framing that this paper provides a signal to the results and that further study is warranted could be emphasised to get over this issue.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Thank you for revising this paper following the reviewer's comments. Whilst the comments have been addressed with rebuttals, a number of the comments could have been address better. These have been summarised above. For the purposes of clarity, these are also outlined below:
1. I still feel that the research question could be more adequately answered with a IPD analysis. The authors suggest that this is not in the public domain. However, in systematic review terms, data can be requested from authors to undertaken IPD analyses (as happens in reality) and therefore becomes available if requested. I therefore suggest that if the authors choose not to do this, and the editorial team feel that there is sufficient information in this publication to accept the paper, then the use of a IPD analysis is documented in the Discussion section either as a limitation or as a future research suggestion. This would be beneficial.

2. Framing that this paper provides a signal to the results and that further study is warranted could be emphasised to get over this issue.

I would strongly recommend that these changes are made so that the reader is made explicitly aware of this. I think the paper is an improvement, but this minor amendment would also be useful.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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