

Reviewer's comments

The abstract is truncated.and the aim of this study is to systematically review these studies. COMMENT: English language needs polishing. COMMENT: The objectives of this review should be unified throughout the abstract and article. The 3 objectives presented at the end of the introduction should be wrapped up in the abstract. The presented results in the abstract are not conclusive and should be presented with more in-depth. Methods: To be more appealing, a flow chart of the study design is suggested with more details than that presented in figure 1. Accordingly, remove repeated text. Results: Avoid redundancy and repeating results mentioned in the tables. The results text should not include references. Only present the results reached for this review. The references could be included in the tables (as they were compared) otherwise, consider references in the discussion only. It is too lengthy and should be better wrapped up. The conclusion should be more concise and focused. As a review of literature article, it could include up to 60 references. Table 1 should be better designed so that it all comes on one page. Tables need to be self descriptive.

Responses

1. Have adjusted the abstract as requested. The conclusion also addresses the objectives of the review (as described in the article)
2. The 'results' section in the abstract reflect the lack of consensus of the optimal treatment algorithms associated with AMIC and this is highlighted explicitly in the conclusion
3. Repeated text in the main article removed and references are made to the tables as opposed to repeating the information
4. Conclusion made more succinct
5. Tables (including information presented) have been made clearer