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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
none

Minor Essential Revisions
Figure 1 is not referenced in the text. Figure 2 is referenced in the text but was not provided - maybe you meant to label it Table 2?

Discretionary Revisions
Under 'quality of evidence' within the results section, you may consider being cautious in using the term 'secondary study' - I think there may be confusion between secondary reports (i.e. linked to a main results paper) and reports of secondary studies (e.g. reviews, or analysis of secondary data). This is also confusing as I was under the impression that secondary studies were excluded from the review.

In the same section, it may help to make more explicit the fact that none of the observational studies were rated 'good' quality - was this automatically due to the fact that they were not RCTs?

Additional file 3 - it would be helpful to include reasons why studies were rated 'mixed' rather than 'good' (e.g. Ickovics 2007). Also, I would remove the findings included in the table.

Under 'effectiveness' within results, it might be helpful to explain why findings were considered inconclusive (this was explained in some but not all cases). For example the Florina RCT (also, why was this called 'this latter study'?). In the paragraph below this one, typo: 'in multiply-disadvantaged'.
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