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We again thank the reviewers of this manuscript who offered additional comments and requests for clarification. We respond as follows.

Editor:

Please...ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style [link included]

We have referred to the link provided and also to the specific Instructions for Authors for the BMC, P&C journal. We believe that we have complied with each request; although we are grateful for further direction, if necessary, particularly with respect to spacing, font character and size, for which we cannot find specific information.

Referee 1:

The author is integrative approach to analysis continues to be statistically and inferentially weak, and the paper would be improved by providing the simple point estimates.....The authors then could explain the caveats associated with more traditional point estimates

We have reported rates and rate ranges, and provided further explanation in the narrative to describe our rationale for choosing this approach to analysis. We believe that the heterogeneity of the programs included in our integrative review, and the inclusion of non-peer-reviewed data extracted from program reports, require that we be conservative in our computations.

...It would have been preferable to broadly edit the manuscript....which is unnecessarily long....

We have conducted further editing to reduce the length of the manuscript.

Referee 2:

...I would like to see the exact figures for the 3 increases in facility rates.

We included the exact figures in the narrative.

In the 5th column of table 1, I am still unclear....why is [the size of the sample] not the same figure as for column 7? A footnote would help here.

We chose to remove column 7, as it was additional, explanatory, information (already supported by a footnote in the previous version).

I would be happy to see table 6 be removed

We removed table 6, and reflected the content of that table in the narrative.