Reviewer B y C:

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

I suggest that in the wording of the title it is included that it is a systematic review, since otherwise it gives the idea that it is an experimental work.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

Restructure the abstract

The objective seems that it is an experimental investigation and they must emphasize that it is a systematic review.

It is missing to include results derived from the systematic review.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Regular

Remarks

Improve the content of the introduction, document the work more.

There are writing errors.

Scientific names should be written in italics.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Regular

Remarks

I suggest including a figure where the selection scheme of the articles that followed is presented.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Regular

Remarks

There are errors in the writing of the citations that include correcting those aspects.

Correct the numbering of the tables (01) or (1).

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

There are errors in the writing of the citations that include correcting those aspects.

When several works are cited, it is not necessary to place all the numbers, they should only place the block, for example on page 12 where they have (18,19,20,21,22,23) change it to (18-23).

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

Improve your writing.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

Remarks

They have errors in their writing.

Combine uppercase with lowercase.

They do not follow the same format.

Some do not have the name of the magazine.

Homogenize the way of reporting references.

Author response:

1. The title was improved, adding a systematic review.

2. Abstract was improved as suggested by the reviewer, in addition to enhancing the grammar or writing.

3. improved writing in the results section.

4. The discussion of the results was better adapted according to the reviewers.

5. the bibliography was verified and ratified to Vancouver style.