ITEMIZED LIST OF THE REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Manuscript ID: ijerph-1654750

Title: *"Efficacy of magnetic therapy in pain reduction in patients with chronic pelvic pain: a systematic review"*

Dear Reviewer,

We greatly appreciate the editor´s and reviewers' kind and encouraging comments about our study. We have followed their suggestions, trying to incorporate them into the revised version of our manuscript. We uploaded the tracked changes manuscript, the clean version revised manuscript and itemized point-by-point response to the reviewer' comments are presented below.

Editor´s and Reviewers´ comments:

**Reviewer 2*

RV: Reviewer
AA: Authors

RV: Dear authors,

A significant progress has been done by the authors for the improvement of the article entitled "Efficacy of magnetic therapy in pain reduction in patients with chronic pelvic pain: a systematic review". However, my main concerns on the inappropriate analysis of discussion still remain unchanged. A significant part of the discussion still analyses the outcomes of the study. More specifically, no change has been detected among the initial and the revised version of the discussion.

AA: First, authors want to thank the modifications suggested by the reviewer and his/her effort to improve our manuscript. Following the reviewer´s recommendation, we have attempted to better clarify our discussion of the manuscript. Without a doubt, their recommendations help us to give more clarity and structure our limitations part. We agree with your comment. We have shortened this section. A new paragraph about limitation was added added in lines 360 to 369 on page 14 in the revised clean version in the discussion section. Thank you very much for your suggestion.

The new paragraph in the limitation section now reads:

"There are several limitations to the analysis that should be considered when interpreting these results. First, heterogeneity among the different studies was so extensive that a meta-analysis could not be performed. It was difficult to find articles about the study topic, despite the search conducted in multiple electronic databases of published studies.

Second, there was little uniformity in study populations, the small sample sizes, interventions and their duration, measured variables, and different measurement instruments. Because all the articles presented in this review are quite heterogeneous in certain parameters; moreover, one of them presents moderate methodological quality [21]. Therefore, the results must be interpreted with caution, since the studies included in the review used different devices, treatment time and time between sessions"

Please, do not hesitate to contact me, if you require further corrections and information.
Thank you in advance

Kind Regards,