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Reviewer's report:

I have a few minor comments on the author's response.

1. Original comments: authors mentioned that they collected data on domain, type of intervention, comparison, outcome measured, and number, type, justification, methods, and results in relation to the overall effect estimate of the subgroups studied. This information is too abstract. Consider adding more details.

   Author response: We agree with the reviewer that this information is too abstract. More details have been added here. Later in the Methods section more details were already provided.

   Comment: I believe I was commenting on the methods section (Data extraction and analysis), and I didn't see sufficient details.

2. Original Comment: Page 5, 7 criteria for assessing quality of IPDMA: there is lack of justification for using the selected 7 criteria. It is desirable for authors to describe the basis on which they chose the 7 criteria for assessing quality of IPDMA.

   New comment: Authors adequately responded toward the comment. Why not include some of their justification in the manuscript to enhance reading.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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