Review

The authors have answered most of my comments to my satisfaction. I would however suggest a few minor changes to improve the quality of this paper.

The authors mentioned that efficacy was measured by validated scales that measure panic symptoms. Please state this in the methodology or in the aim section of the introduction.

The authors mentioned that papers were not filtered by age/gender and other demographics. Please state this in the methodology section.

The authors do indeed mention that doses of current medications are lower than those used for other psychotic disorders. Could the authors please add a reference or state usual dosage ranges.

Publication bias. Please address it in the limitations (add a reference to the high publication bias in psychiatry, Turner EH. Publication Bias, with a Focus on Psychiatry: Causes and Solutions. CNS drugs. 2013:1-12).

Abstract: as they stand the conclusions are a bit confusing because they make the reader wonder why the authors suggest a therapeutical role of anti-psychotics despite the lower quality/poorer reliability of current studies (‘small, open-label”). I would suggest that the authors split the conclusions into 2 sentences. Sentence 1 could summarize the findings. Sentence 2 could highlight clinical implications.

The authors mention that they did not use a quality assessment because their search includes both RCT and open labels. I would recommend that the authors check the CRD Quality thresholds (Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Reviewers’ Handbook. Version 4.2.1) and Ibrahim et al.’s systematic review of studies of depression prevalence in university students. (Journal of Psychiatric Research 2013, 47(3):391-400) as examples on how to address this issue. They could then add a table/short paragraph addressing this quality evaluation.