

## **Answers to Reviewer comments:**

### **Comment:**

The method used is described in detail, however, it is not clear if some ranks were attributed to analyzed terms, and if so, on the basis of what criteria these ranks were attributed and analyzed. This is an important element of PRISMA statement.

### **Answer:**

Thank you for your comment.

As we did not perform a meta-analysis and only a systematic review, some of the ranks were not used during the analysis (see attached revised PRISMA checklist).

Following, we will give you some more details about the analyzed terms and ranks regarding the PRISMA statement, which we revised accordingly in the manuscript if necessary (in red).

Rank 10: as stated in the text (page 7) we extracted the data from the full-text of each manuscript and did not contact each investigator for further informations

Rank 11: we revised the text on page 7 for further definition of each analyzed term

Rank 18: results of analyzed terms were already cited in the text page 8 and 9 and tables 1-4

Rank 20: the analyzed manuscripts were cohort descriptions without an intervention vs control group, therefore we were not able to present further terms such as confidence interval in a forest plot.