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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes. The authors presented two clear study aims well supported by background rationales.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, the methods for a systematic review are appropriate and well described. The authors had completed a thorough search for the relevant articles from different databases. The screening and filtering process is well described and key information is defined.

   Some suggestions: Table 1 and 2 seemed not necessary, and I would suggest the authors to summarize the content in Table 1&2 and present them in the body of text. In Table 4, please add “.” following “no” so it clearly represents number than “no”.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. The data are sound. This is a systematic review, and 52 articles met the criteria and were included in the analysis. However, it would be better to see some description of the article quality assessment in the methods and a quality score summary in the results. Quality scores are reported in Table 5, but there is no description in the text to assess how good those articles are. How the quality of the articles impact on the conclusion should also be discussed.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   This is a systematic review, so some standards for reporting and data deposition may not apply.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   It seemed to me that the authors can expand their discussion a little more on the following two aspects: (1) which one of the SNAPW was found having more significant improvement related to health literacy intervention? In another word, is health literacy intervention equally effective/ineffective on all the five behaviors? Authors touched a little about this on p.11. (2) Only 4 articles were from Australia and New Zealand, but a substantial portion of the discussion is related to policy in Australia, the different between cultures and healthcare systems and other factors should also been taken into consideration when discussing practical
implications.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, the study limitations are clearly discussed.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. Overall the manuscript is well written. But authors need to check the table format requirements of the journal. Is there a limit of the number of tables in a paper?

• Recommendation: Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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