

Reply to reviewer 1: I have corrected the Grammatical errors, clarity and writing style via a third-party English editing service. I am attaching the certificate herewith.

I am unclear about the similarity index issue. It is 17% which is less than 20% which is demand of the reviewer 1. So, do I need to re-edit?

Reviewer 1 also states that Introduction should be expanded but has not specified, in which aspect. If the journal would be kind enough to guide me in that regard I will do as stated.

Reply to reviewer 2: According to reviewer 2 I should have used PRISMA 2020 checklist and flow diagram. But the instructions in the Authors instruction page of the journal clearly state that PRISMA 2009 checklist and flow diagram should be used.

Reply to reviewer 3: I have used MEDLINE and EMBASE because they are more feasible in a low-income country like Pakistan where this research was performed without any funding. Both the data bases are free and accessible. At the time of literature search Ovid platform was open via Higher Education Commission Pakistan so I accessed it using the search strategy but did not find relevant literature at the start while during the middle of the search process access got restricted so that is a limitation of our study. Rest of the databases like CINAHL etc are not freely available for access.

There are many case reports and less number of trials and reviews because that is what the search results revealed.

Reply to Company editor-in-chief:

We have formatted the manuscript as instructed by the editor in chief and the instructions provided via mail. The keywords were entered in the Reference Citation Analysis Software on individual and collective search basis and it failed to retrieve any relevant results that fit the eligibility criteria. English Language Certificate is being uploaded.