

Peer-review Comments and Author Responses

Reviewer 1

1. *Discussion: The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit evaluation or comparison of its findings against existing theories or treatments.*

Thank you for pointing this out. We agree with this comment. Therefore, we have made the necessary revisions to the Discussion section to include an explicit evaluation and comparison of our findings against existing theories and treatments. The changes are in the discussion section on pages 9-10.

2. *Some references: The article cites specific measures like "IBS-SSS," "IBS-QoL," and "GSRS-IBS". A more explained text would help the readers to better understand the outcomes used.*

We agree. We have revised the manuscript to explain the specific measures mentioned. The changes can be found on pages 6-7.

3. *Table: In Table 2 (Characteristics of the included studies) there are 1 missing subtitle to explain MFT. It was considered the same as MBSR but with other acronyms.*

We acknowledge this comment. We have added a subtitle to Table 2 to explain "MFT." The change can be found in Table 2. The changes can be found on page 18.

Reviewer 2

4. *Title: I found the title clear, informative and in accordance for the review presented.*

We appreciate the positive feedback on the title.

5. *The abstract shows a good overall of the study with important details presented. I did not find inconsistencies between the abstract and the text. In the abstract I found enough information that is needed to understand the Mini Riview, with the most important details. I consider that background is really good, but it could synthesize a little bit more to be able to better develop other areas.*

Thank you for your comment about the abstract. We have revised the background section to make it more concise while retaining the essential information. The changes can be found on page 2.

6. *I consider that: "studies in languages other than English were excluded if researchers required additional proficiency or faced obstacles in interpreting the*

results due to non-native fluency." This part could be synthesized as an exclusion criterion and not in the screening process.

We agree with this comment. We have changed the passage to the section "Selection of studies - inclusion and exclusion criteria." The change can be found on page 4.

7. *In Study Selection, it is not necessary to include the abbreviations of the people who carried it out.*

We agree with this comment. We have changed the text. The change can be found on page 3.

8. *Their conclusion is in line with the topic, I really liked that it pointed out about the high bias that exists in these studies.*

We appreciate the positive feedback on the conclusion.

Reviewer 3

9. *Discussion: The manuscript would benefit from more explicit evaluation or comparison of its findings against existing theories or treatments.*

We agree with this comment. We have made the necessary revisions in the discussion section to include a more explicit evaluation and comparison of our findings against existing theories and treatments. The changes can be found on pages 9-10.

10. *Some references: The article cites specific measures like "IBS-SSS," "IBS-QoL," and "GSRs-IBS". A more explained text would help the readers to better understand the outcomes used.*

We agree with this suggestion. We have provided additional explanations for the specific measures mentioned in the manuscript. The changes can be found on pages 6-7.

11. *Table: In Table 2 (Characteristics of the included studies) there are 1 missing subtitle to explain MFT. It was considered the same as MBSR but with other acronyms.*

We have addressed the missing subtitle in Table 2 to explain "MFT" as recommended. The changes can be found on page 18.

Reviewer 4

12. *First, in the result section, I am missing a summary about the participants included in the selected articles. How many patients are included in total in the review?*

Where are this patients form? Sex of the participants? (this is only named regarding 3 of the 7 articles that only included women). In the results, you started talking directly about the specific studies, but you are missing a paragraph with characterization of all the studies in the beginning.

We agree with this comment. We have added a summary of participant characteristics in Table 2. The changes can be found on page 18.

13. *About the discussion, I think you need to elaborate it in more detail. Some of the information in there should be in the result part of the article. You need to improve the discussion, talking about the differences or similarities of your analysis with some other systematic reviews and meta-analysis in the topic (there are some of them already published, and you should compare your results). Also, you can discuss here in more detail how the bias found in the trial as affect the result of your minireview, and the difficulties to overcome some of this bias (for example, probably is very difficult to do a blinded RCT in this kind of intervention).*

We agree with this suggestion. We have enhanced the discussion section by providing comparisons with other relevant studies. The changes can be found on pages 9-10.