PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Prevalence and associated factors of psychological distress among patients with breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis
AUTHORS	Tang, Wen-Zhen; Mangantig, Ernest; Iskandar, Yulita Hanum P; Cheng, Shi-li; Yusuf, Azlina; Jia, Kui

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	*Iverson, Marissa*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	UConn Health, Library
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	19-Jul-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for submitting this systematic review and meta-analysis on the many components of psychological distress among patients with breast cancer. Overall this study appears well-executed and relevant, but the reporting is not complete per PRISMA guidelines. There are also issues with the formatting of the references and there are some controlled vocabulary mistakes in the PubMed and Embase search strategies. Overall, please review the PRISMA extensions for Abstracts and Searching. 1. The abstract is missing several items, see the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist. This includes: inclusion and exclusion criteria; all information sources (please include the China National Knowledge Infrastructure and Wan Fang); the date when each search was last run (through February 2023 doesn't indicate when exactly the searches were run); methods to assess risk of bias; methods used to present and synthesize results; and limitations of the study. 2. Additionally, see item #s 7 and 8 on the PRISMA for Abstracts Checklist for the level of detail required. 3. In Section 2.1 Search Strategy, please indicate the platforms for each database and the exact date the searches were last run. 4. In section 3.1 Study Selection, how were duplicates identified and removed? Please describe any citation management or screening tools that were used, if any. 5. Additionally in section 3.1 Study Selection, per PRISMA Checklist item #16b, studies that were excluded at the full text level need to be cited. Please provide references for those 223 studies. 6. In Figure 1, please describe if duplicates were identified and removed by automation tools or manually. I recommend using the PRISMA flow diagram provided on the PRISMA website as a template, as it better demonstrates the screening process. The current figure makes it appear that the 18,788 duplicates were screened. Additionally, please account for the cited references of the included studies in the "additional records" box. If only one record was found from the cited references, please clarify where

that one record came from. Lastly, here it says the last database searched was "Wangfang" but in section 2.1 it's referred to as "Wan Fang." Please provide the correct name of the database in both places.

7. In-text citations should be in regular sized font, not superscript. Additionally, in the References List, only the first three authors should be listed followed by et al, and journal titles should not be in italics. See the Vancouver Style and the page on Formatting Your Paper on the BMJ Author Hub website: https://authors.bmj.com/writing-and-formatting/formatting-your-paper/

8. I recommend re-running and updating all searches, as it's been five months since the last time they were run and relevant literature may have been published during that time.

These comments are specific to Supplementary Table 1:

9. Please follow PRISMA-S Extension for Searching. All search strategies need to be documented. This table is missing the searches for the CNKI and Wan Fang. Please provide the database platforms and the date they were last searched as well.

10. In the PubMed search, distress is not a Mesh term. You'll need to search it only in the title and abstract fields. I also recommend cleaning up all the extraneous parentheses to increase reproducibility. This search could be formatted similarly to the Embase search by using quotation marks to indicate phrase searching and having an OR between the search terms within sections 1 and 2. Take a look at the search details to see how exactly PubMed is interpreting each search term, and possible include those to increase transparency.

11. For the Web of Science search, please indicate what databases within Web of Science were searched, as different versions are available to libraries/institutions. I recommend using quotation marks to force phrase searching, too. Lastly, some of the terms are being searched in just the title or just the abstract, but not both. The other database searches are searching for all terms in both fields. I'm not sure if this was done in error or if it was intentional. If it was intentional, please ignore.

12. In the Embase search, psychological distress is not an Emtree term. It is a synonym of the preferred term, which is "distress syndrome" and I recommend using that instead.

13. Depending on what platform the Cochrane Library was searched, the provided search syntax may not work. Please check and provide the platform used in the table. Additionally, I recommend using quotation marks to force phrase searching.

14. In general, you may want to consult with an informationist or experienced health sciences librarian for assistance with these searches.

REVIEWER NAME	*Berhili, Soufiane*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Mohammed V University of Rabat
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	03-Oct-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors did a great job by performing this metaanalysis. Nevertheless, some points needs to be clarified to help making the paper more suitable for publication.

Specific Annotations :
- P: 4 / line 51 & 52: this sentence needs to be reformulated to make the sense clearer.
- P: 4 / line 36: use the past tense: "the search strategy "was" adjusted…"
- P: 4 / line 51: use the past tense: "the sample size "was" less than 100…"
- P: 5 / line 3: use the past tense in the whole paragraph describing data extraction: "the inclusion criteria "was" excluded…"
- P: 8 / Table 2: please add the reference of each study after citing its author's name and year
- P: 8 / Table 2: the studies included are cited by their authors' first name ◊ please try to use last names to be more suitable for literature review.
- P12 / Line 18: please add countries to the sentence : "… in developed (countries) is 47% …"

Query :
- Some studies included in the metaanalysis have used both the DT and the HADS in their original reports (for example : Berhili (soufiane) & al. 2017 found a psychological distress rate of 26,9% using the HADS and of 44,3% using the DT). Thus, the authors should describe the methodology (in the materials and methods chapter) that allowed them to choose one tool over the others that have been used by the original authors of the included studies.

REVIEWER NAME	*Chiesi, Francesca*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Univ Florence
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	19-Oct-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript "Prevalence and associated factors of psychological distress among patients with breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis". The methodology is sound and the results are well discussed. However, I'm skeptical about the full originality of this systematic review and meta-analysis. Whereas the authors refer to general psychological distress in breast cancer patients, about half of the studies included in the review employ depression and anxiety assessment tools (HADS, DASS). As such, I suggest to mention in the Introduction previous reviews (e.g., Li J, Zhang F, Wang W, et al Prevalence and risk factors of anxiety and depression among patients with breast cancer: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis BMJ Open 2021;11:e041588. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041588; Walker, Zoe J., et al. "Depression, anxiety, and other mental disorders in patients with cancer in low-and lower-middle–income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis." JCO global oncology 7 (2021): 1233-1250) stressing similarities and differences with the current study, and providing evidence of its originality.

Minor points:
• The abstract is puzzling. It should summarize the results, not provide them in detail.
• Why studies with less than 100 cases were excluded?
• p.4 (Study selection): Studies were excluded if: Non-Chinese and English literature. I guess is "Non-English".

	• Why was it included one study using the CD-RISC-10 (Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale)? It is not a measure of psychological distress.

REVIEWER NAME	*Boehm, Katja*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	University Witten / Herdecke, Institute of Integrative Medicine, Chair of Medical Theory, Integrative and Antroposophy
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	17-Jan-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	Many thanks to the authors for this valuable piece of research. This is a systematic review and meta-analysis on the subject of "Prevalence and associated factors of psychological distress among patients with breast cancer". I would like to make a few comments, which may or may not improve the quality / reporting of the article. I am very pleased to see that a quality assessment was carried out for this type of research. In my opinion, this is of uttermost importance when assessing the methodological quality of clinical studies as bad studies can skew the results. This followed up with a subgroup analysis is the correct way of meta-analyzing the results and this tram has done so correctly. Thus, I am confident that the conclusion are deemed correct, especially when they say that the correlations found in various studies need to be taken into consideration by breast cancer healthcare teams when planning and developing strategies to prevent and intervene in psychological stress that goes hand in hand with the treatment of breast cancer patients. Heterogeneity among studies is to be expected, since research teams look at different angles and apply a different number of research tools to examine psychological distress in this patient group. Whereas the majority of meta-analyses in this research topic analyses interventions helpful for psychological stress in breast cancer patients, this is the first review to estimate the prevalence and associated factors by pooling data from cohort and cross-section studies. Possibly, a more precise recommendation for future studies could have been made I have no recommendations to make, which could help improve the quality of reporting of this piece of research. I therefore heartily recommend a publication of this systematic review and meta-analysis in its current form.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

1. . The abstract is missing several items, see the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist. This includes: inclusion and exclusion criteria; all information sources (please include the China National Knowledge Infrastructure and Wan Fang); the date when each search was last run (through February 2023 doesn't indicate when exactly the searches were run); methods to assess risk of bias; methods used to present and synthesize results; and limitations of the study.

The authors' comment: We quite agree with your suggestion and we have followed the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist and corrected the abstract.

2.Additionally, see item #s 7 and 8 on the PRISMA for Abstracts Checklist for the level of detail required.

The authors' comment: Thank you for your suggestion, we have corrected the content of the results in the abstract part(Page 2 line 16 – line 32).

3. In Section 2.1 Search Strategy, please indicate the platforms for each database and the exact date the searches were last run.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have added the exact data the searches were last run (Page 4 line 13 & Supplementary Table 1).

4. - In section 3.1 Study Selection, how were duplicates identified and removed? Please describe any citation management or screening tools that were used, if any.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We used endnoteX9 software to manage the retrieved literature, which can automatically identify literature with the same title and author as duplicate literature (Page 4 line 31).

5. - Additionally in section 3.1 Study Selection, per PRISMA Checklist item #16b, studies that were excluded at the full text level need to be cited. Please provide references for those 223 studies.

The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. However, by reading similar articles in your journal, we found that they did not cite the excluded articles either.

①Bartoszko JJ, Elias Z, Rudziak P, Lo CKL, Thabane L, Mertz D, Loeb M. Prognostic factors for streptococcal toxic shock syndrome: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2022 Dec 1;12(12):e063023. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-063023. PMID: 36456018; PMCID: PMC9716873.

②Wang J, Wu X, Lai W, Long E, Zhang X, Li W, Zhu Y, Chen C, Zhong X, Liu Z, Wang D, Lin H. Prevalence of depression and depressive symptoms among outpatients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2017 Aug 23;7(8):e017173. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017173. PMID: 28838903; PMCID: PMC5640125.

③Kwan MY, Yick KL, Yip J, Tse CY. Hallux valgus orthosis characteristics and effectiveness: a systematic review with meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2021 Aug 18;11(8):e047273. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047273. PMID: 34408037; PMCID: PMC8375760.

④Qi S, Luo X, Liu S, Ling B, Si M, Jin H. Effect of vitamin B2, vitamin C, vitamin D, vitamin E and folic acid in adults with essential hypertension: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2024 Jan 30;14(1):e074511. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074511. PMID: 38296289; PMCID: PMC10828875.

6. In Figure 1, please describe if duplicates were identified and removed by automation tools or manually. I recommend using the PRISMA flow diagram provided on the PRISMA website as a template, as it better demonstrates the screening process. The current figure makes it appear that the 18,788 duplicates were screened. Additionally, please account for the cited references of the included studies in the "additional records" box. If only one record was found from the cited references, please clarify where that one record came from. Lastly, here it

says the last database searched was "Wangfang" but in section 2.1 it's referred to as "Wan Fang." Please provide the correct name of the database in both places.

The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We used the flow chart template from the PRISMA website and corrected the flow chart data (Figure 1).

7. In-text citations should be in regular sized font, not superscript. Additionally, in the References List, only the first three authors should be listed followed by et al, and journal titles should not be in italics. See the Vancouver Style and the page on Formatting Your Paper on the BMJ Author Hub website: https://authors.bmj.com/writing-and-formatting/formatting-your-paper/.

The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We have corrected the reference style.

8. I recommend re-running and updating all searches, as it's been five months since the last time they were run and relevant literature may have been published during that time

The authors' comment: Thank you for your interest in the quality of the study. However, after the discussion of our research group, we searched in February and submitted the manuscript in June. We thought that the current search was comprehensive enough and we decided not to re-search due to time constraints.

9. For specific comment to Supplementary Table 1

The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We have corrected the searching strategy in Supplementary Table 1.

Reviewer 2

1. For specific annotations:

P: 4 / line 51 & 52: this sentence needs to be reformulated to make the sense clearer.

- P: 4 / line 36: use the past tense: "the search strategy "was" adjusted…"

- P: 4 / line 51: use the past tense: "the sample size "was" less than 100…"

- P: 5 / line 3: use the past tense in the whole paragraph describing data extraction: "the inclusion criteria "was" excluded…"

- P: 8 / Table 2: please add the reference of each study after citing its author's name and year

- P: 8 / Table 2: the studies included are cited by their authors' first name ◊ please try to use last names to be more suitable for literature review.

- P12 / Line 18: please add countries to the sentence : "… in developed (countries) is 47% …".

The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We have made corrections according to your suggestion.

2.Some studies included in the meta-analysis have used both the DT and the HADS in their original reports (for example : Berhili (soufiane) & al. 2017 found a psychological distress rate of 26,9% using the HADS and of 44,3% using the DT). Thus, the authors should describe the methodology (in the materials and methods chapter) that allowed them to choose one tool over the others that have been used by the original authors of the included studies.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We add to this in the materials and methods chapter(Page 4 line 23-25).

Reviewer 3

1. However, I'm skeptical about the full originality of this systematic review and meta-analysis. Whereas the authors refer to general psychological distress in breast cancer patients, about half of the studies included in the review employ depression and anxiety assessment tools (HADS, DASS). As such, I suggest to mention in the Introduction previous reviews (e.g., Li J, Zhang F, Wang W, et al Prevalence and risk factors of anxiety and depression among patients with breast cancer: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis BMJ Open 2021;11:e041588. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-041588; Walker, Zoe J., et al. "Depression, anxiety, and other mental disorders in patients with cancer in low-and lower-middle–income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis." JCO global oncology 7 (2021): 1233-1250) stressing similaritis and differences with the current study, and providing evidence of its originality.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. In terms of Li J, Zhang F, Wang W, et al Prevalence and risk factors of anxiety and depression among patients with breast cancer: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis BMJ Open 2021;11:e041588, The study summarized the risk factors of anxiety and depression in breast cancer patients, and they did not conduct meta regression analysis on the prevalence of anxiety and depression, only carried out descriptive analysis. However, our study was to quantitatively summarize and analyze the prevalence and correlates of psychological distress in breast cancer patients. Furthermore, for the study, Walker, Zoe J., et al. "Depression, anxiety, and other mental disorders in patients with cancer in low-and lower-middle–income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. It just focuses on low-and lower-middle–income countries, which is different from our study.

2. The abstract is puzzling. It should summarize the results, not provide them in detail.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have corrected the abstract and retained the main results (Page 2).

3. Why studies with less than 100 cases were excluded?

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Firstly, small sample studies may have sampling error and instability, that is, the results have the risk of reporting bias, which may have a negative impact on the results of Meta-analysis. In addition, in the process of literature screening, we read the full text of the literature with sample size less than 100 and tried to include it in the Meta-analysis, but it was found to have a significant impact on this study. Therefore, we excluded studies with sample sizes less than 100.

4. p.4 (Study selection): Studies were excluded if: Non-Chinese and English literature. I guess is "Non-English".

The authors' comment: Thank you very much. We have corrected it(Page 4 line 29).

5. Why was it included one study using the CD-RISC-10 (Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale)? It is not a measure of psychological distress.

The authors' comment: Thank you for pointing out the mistake. It is our writing mistake and we have corrected it in Table 2 and note.

REVIEWER NAME	*Iverson, Marissa*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	UConn Health, Library
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	04-Apr-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the work you've done to revise your manuscript. Many of my previous concerns and recommendations have been addressed, and here are my current comments:
	Overall, I strongly advise re-running the searches, screening these new results, and adjusting Figure 1 and all analyses accordingly. It has now been over a year since the searches were last run in February 2023. As of early April 2024, the search strategies yield 258 more results in PubMed, 557 more in Embase, and depending on what subset of Cochrane was used, there are between 42-287 more results. This reviewer was unable to replicate the Web of Science, CNKI, or Wan Fang searches, but there are most likely more results in those databases from the past 14 months as well.
	Abstract
1. Section "Data Sources," the words "and two" are unnecessary.
2. Also in "Data Sources," "Wan Fang" is written without a hyphen in between the two words here and also in the Methods Section 2.1. But in Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1, it's written as "Wan-Fang." Please correct.
3. Per the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist #3, please specify the exclusion criteria.
	Figure 1
1. In the box "Duplicate records removed" the last total reads "Records marked as ineligible by artificial." This seems incomplete: artificial what? What part of the process was artificial?
	Supplementary Table 1
1. When this reviewer copied + pasted the second PubMed search strategy to test the search, PubMed reports there is a mismatched forward facing, ie. "(", parenthesis. Please correct so the search is reproducible without errors.
2. It is reported that Embase was searched via the Ovid platform, but the search syntax provided is for Embase through Elsevier. The "exp" operator to explode an Emtree term is in the wrong place, and the title,abstract,keyword field codes as written use incorrect punctuation. Please correct for the Ovid platform, or indicate that the Elsevier platform was used.
3. What parts of the Cochrane Library were used? Based on the totals reported in Figure 1, it seems only the Trials section (CENTRAL, or the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) was used. Please indicate what subsets of the Cochrane Library were used.
4. Please indicate what databases within Web of Science were searched. Different options are available depending on the license.
5. When this reviewer copied + pasted the Web of Science search strategies to test them, both searches resulted in an error message from Web of Science: "Search Error: Invalid query. Please check

	syntax." These searches are not reproducible as written, please correct.

REVIEWER NAME	*Chiesi, Francesca*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Univ Florence
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	28-Mar-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	My comments were adequately addressed.

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1
Overall, I strongly advise re-running the searches, screening these new results, and adjusting Figure 1 and all analyses accordingly. It has now been over a year since the searches were last run in February 2023. As of early April 2024, the search strategies yield 258 more results in PubMed, 557 more in Embase, and depending on what subset of Cochrane was used, there are between 42-287 more results. This reviewer was unable to replicate the Web of Science, CNKI, or Wan Fang searches, but there are most likely more results in those databases from the past 14 months as well.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We re-searched the relevant literature on June 11, 2024, and re-conducted literature screening and data analysis, and corrected the results accordingly.

Abstract
1. Section "Data Sources," the words "and two" are unnecessary.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have deleted them.
2. Also in "Data Sources," "Wan Fang" is written without a hyphen in between the two words here and also in the Methods Section 2.1. But in Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1, it's written as "Wan-Fang." Please correct.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have been unified in the manuscript as Wan-Fang.
3. Per the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist #3, please specify the exclusion criteria.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. There are exclusion criteria in our article (Page 4 line 25-29).

Figure 1
1. In the box "Duplicate records removed" the last total reads "Records marked as ineligible by artificial." This seems incomplete: artificial what? What part of the process was artificial?
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. When using Endnote to manage literature, the software can identify and eliminate some duplicated literature, but there are still some duplicated literatures that cannot be automatically identified by the software, and these documents need to be manually identified and deleted by researchers.

Supplementary Table 1

1. When this reviewer copied + pasted the second PubMed search strategy to test the search, PubMed reports there is a mismatched forward facing, ie. "(", parenthesis. Please correct so the search is reproducible without errors.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your suggestion, we have deleted one "(", parenthesis (Supplementary Table 1).
2. It is reported that Embase was searched via the Ovid platform, but the search syntax provided is for Embase through Elsevier. The "exp" operator to explode an Emtree term is in the wrong place, and the title, abstract, keyword field codes as written use incorrect punctuation. Please correct for the Ovid platform, or indicate that the Elsevier platform was used.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have corrected for the Ovid platform (Supplementary Table 1.)
3. What parts of the Cochrane Library were used? Based on the totals reported in Figure 1, it seems only the Trials section (CENTRAL, or the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) was used. Please indicate what subsets of the Cochrane Library were used.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have added the subsets of the Cochrane library in the Supplementary Table 1.
4. Please indicate what databases within Web of Science were searched. Different options are available depending on the license.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have added the database in the Supplementary Table 1.
5. When this reviewer copied + pasted the Web of Science search strategies to test them, both searches resulted in an error message from Web of Science: "Search Error: Invalid query. Please check syntax." These searches are not reproducible as written, please correct.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. You can use our search strategy to search in the Session Queries box.

VERSION 3 - REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	*Iverson, Marissa*
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	UConn Health, Library
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	Na
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	16-Jul-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the work you've done to revise your manuscript and update the searches. Many of my previous concerns and recommendations have been addressed, and here are my current comments:
	Abstract
	1. Per the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist #3, please specify the exclusion criteria in your abstract.
	References
	1. Please see the formatting instructions on the BMJ Author Hub. Only the first three authors should be listed, followed by "et al" when needed for additional authors. https://authors.bmj.com/writing-and-formatting/formatting-your-paper/
	Figure 1
	1. In the box "Duplicate records removed" the last total reads "Records marked as ineligible by artificial." This seems incomplete: artificial what? What part of the process was artificial? Please

correct.

2. The math between the number of results found in the databases to what was screened, minus the number of records removed before screening doesn't match up. (21067-8330= 12737, not 12015 as is provided.) Please correct.

Supplementary Table 1
1. It is reported that Embase was searched via the Ovid platform, but the search syntax provided is for Embase through Elsevier. The "exp" operator to explode an Emtree term is in the wrong place for the Ovid platform, and the title,abstract,keyword field codes as written use incorrect punctuation. Please correct for the Ovid platform's syntax, or indicate that the Elsevier platform was used instead.

2. Please indicate what databases within Web of Science were searched to ensure reproducibility. Different options are available depending on the license at your institution.

VERSION 3 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1
Abstract
1. Per the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts Checklist #3, please specify the exclusion criteria in your abstract.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your suggestion, we have added the exclusion criteria in our abstract (Page 2 line 8– line 10).

References
1. Please see the formatting instructions on the BMJ Author Hub. Only the first three authors should be listed, followed by "et al" when needed for additional authors.
https://authors.bmj.com/writing-and-formatting/formatting-your-paper/.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your suggestion, we have corrected the format of references.

Figure 1
1. In the box "Duplicate records removed" the last total reads "Records marked as ineligible by artificial." This seems incomplete: artificial what? What part of the process was artificial? Please correct.
Thank you very much for your suggestion. When using Endnote to manage literature, the software can identify and eliminate some duplicated literature, but there are still some duplicated literatures that cannot be automatically identified by the software, and these documents need to be manually identified and deleted by researchers (after reading title, journal name, publication year, and author name). For example, sometimes, the author or title of an article exported in PubMed is uppercase, while the article exported in WOS or other databases is lowercase, which cannot be automatically recognized by Endnote and needs to be deleted manually by researchers.

2. The math between the number of results found in the databases to what was screened, minus the number of records removed before screening doesn't match up. (21067-8330= 12737, not 12015 as is provided.) Please correct.

The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. Thank you for pointing out the errors in this manuscript. After checking again by our research team, we have corrected the data in Figure 1 and the text description of the study selection.

Supplementary Table 1
1. It is reported that Embase was searched via the Ovid platform, but the search syntax provided is for Embase through Elsevier. The "exp" operator to explode an Emtree term is in the wrong place for the Ovid platform, and the title, abstract, keyword field codes as written use incorrect punctuation. Please correct for the Ovid platform's syntax, or indicate that the Elsevier platform was used instead.
The authors' comment: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have indicated the Elsevier platform.

2. Please indicate what databases within Web of Science were searched to ensure reproducibility. Different options are available depending on the license at your institution.
The authors' comment: Thank you for your comment. We have added the databases of Web of Science.