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| **EDITORIAL COMMENT’S on revised paper (if any)** | **Authors’ response to editor’s comments** |
| 1. Clarify Geographic Scope and Generalizability: Most studies included are from Western countries. Please clarify in the discussion how this limits the generalizability of findings to global adoption contexts.Screening Tools Section: The emphasis on ICAST is appropriate, but more discussion on why other tools are not being used (or evaluated) would strengthen this section. Consider expanding on potential alternatives or the need for an adoption-specific screening tool.Expand on Limitations: While limitations are mentioned, a more nuanced reflection on potential publication bias, language restrictions, and lack of control groups in the included studies would enhance transparency.**Abstract: Consider including more quantitative data (e.g., number of studies using ICAST, most common injury percentages) to strengthen the impact.****Language and Style: Minor grammatical edits could improve flow (e.g., “bold for baseline differences” seems out of place in the Quality Assessment section).****Figures/Tables: Ensure that Figure 1 (PRISMA flow diagram) and Table 2 (Study characteristics) are clearly labeled and properly formatted in the final layout.****References: Reference formatting is generally sound, but ensure consistency in journal titles (some are abbreviated, others are not).** | **Thanku sir added****Yes added****Expansion done****rewritten****Yes sir done****Corrected** **Done sir** |