

Reviewer's comment

I disagree with the approach of only highlighting the better quality studies. The authors justify their approach by citing a reference from 2001, but the methodological thinking of 15 years ago has changed over time. When I did my first systematic review in 2000, poor-quality studies could be excluded entirely from review. Such thinking no longer exists. To gain insight into the overall body of knowledge on a topic, the evidence from all studies should be summarized, with the low-quality studies discussed separately (but still discussed) from the better quality studies. The authors should strive to discuss all of the included studies in their paper. Otherwise, they put the spotlight on a subset of articles and do not report the totality of the evidence. Recent methods advances with respect to grading the strength of evidence are indicative of the need to include all of the evidence (good and bad) in systematic reviews.