

We thank the editors and the reviewers for considering our manuscript and advising changes to further improve it. We have made all the suggested changes and hope, you will find it appropriate for publication now. However, we will be happy to make any further changes you may suggest.

No.	Reviewer's comments	Authors reply	Changes made
#1	The title reflects the main topic of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes the work described in the manuscript well, the keywords reflect the focus of your manuscript and describe the background, current status and significance of your review in a broad and meaningful way.	We thank the reviewer for encouraging comments.	No changes made.
	What is missing in your explanations is the exact procedure in the selection of articles for the review. Here you should explain exactly how you proceeded in the selection of literature, what the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the literature reviewed were. The aim of the review is well achieved, even if there are still gaps in the methodology.	Thank you for your inputs.	Have added a detailed paragraph on the search methodology
	The contribution of your review is clinically relevant. The manuscript adequately and appropriately links the results found and emphasizes the most important points concisely, clearly and logically. The conclusion is comprehensible overall, but could have been more precise. The tables are sufficient, of good quality and illustrate the content of the work in an appropriate manner. The manuscript cites a wide range of references, some of which are older, including the most recent and authoritative references in an appropriate manner.	Thank you for your inputs. We have made the conclusions more precise.	Changes made in the conclusions