

Dear Editor,

We appreciate your efforts to review our article. We consider that your comments will significantly contribute to our study. You can find below our point to point response to your comments.

1. *Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No. More details could be given on the procedure of screening and rejection process to reach the ultimate figure of 47 papers. Authors should elaborate on PICOTS - Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Time frame and Setting. They should also present a flow chart for final selection of papers. The 27 aspects of PRISMA 2020 should be addressed in the paper.*

-The procedure of literature research, the selection and rejection criteria of the eligible articles were described in more detail as suggested. PICOTS framework (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, Time frame and Setting) was applied for the clarification of selection criteria. Please refer to the Materials and Methods section. The final selection of papers was presented via flow chart as suggested. Please refer to the table file.

-The 27 aspects of PRISMA 2020 were addressed as suggested. The Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies was conducted for all the eligible articles. Please refer to the table file.

All the necessary changes were marked with red coloured text. Duplicate reference citations detected during revision were deleted, therefore, the total number of the eligible articles changed from 47 to 45.

2. *Please correct et al should have a period after al. (et al.). Only last name of authors should be mentioned in text. Page 10. Bhatti et al. study may be written as Study by Bhatti et al. Similarly Meier et al. study, page 10, Richa Gupta et al trial page 17. Some other minor corrections are noted in the file returned.*

A period after et al. was added as suggested. The first names of authors were removed from the text as suggested.

3. *Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No. Forest plot and ROC curve could have been detailed. Details of sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value etc. could have been elaborated.*

This is a review study; therefore, biostatistics are not applicable.

4. *The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; and (2) The column should be minireviews.*

The contribution of all authors has already been mentioned on the first page of the manuscript. Please refer to p.1 (Author contributions... final manuscript.). The suggested column was added on the first page of the manuscript