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Reviewer: 1

Search could be supplemented by checking Ovid, Medline, Embase also, to get more articles.
Language improvement is required throughout the manuscript.
Method of search, keywords used to select articles for this review is missing in main text.
Inclusion/exclusion criteria to include studies, should be mentioned.
Which information and variables were extracted from the literature for evaluation while studying selected articles, should be mentioned?
It is better to summarize differences in tabular form.
Picture quality can be improved if possible.
References need to be rechecked as per guidelines.

Response:
Firstly, thank you for your comprehensive review. We have taken your advice to heart and we believe that this revised version we are submitting is much improved by your expertise. To elaborate, we have performed a Medline and Ovid search, and added to our references. We have also checked the language and added the methods into the main text, as well as the keywords used to select articles. We created a table to summarize the key features of this condition and increased the resolution of the pictures (uploaded separately). Finally, we have checked and corrected the references according to the journal specifications. We hope you will advise us again if anything else could further improve our manuscript. Thank you very much.

Reviewer: 2

This is a well-written, educational and beneficial review for the clinicians. Its length is adequate and the language is clear.

Response:
Thank you for taking the time to evaluate our manuscript. We are honored by your review, and glad that you enjoyed reading our article.