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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
- None

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Use of the term "risk of bias" to refer to the "methodological quality" of systematic reviews may be confusing. Some readers may interpret this [risk of bias] as referring to the risk of bias within studies included in the literature review.

2. The authors use DHS or MICS (page 8), without first explaining what the abbreviations stand for.

3. The authors state in the first sentence of conclusion: "Our study confirms that high quality evidence on health systems interventions of relevance to LMICs is far from plentiful.......".

   This does not seem correct; what the authors report in the paper is the quality of the systematic reviews (process) NOT the quality of the evidence contained in the reviews.

4. Table 2. There is inconsistency in the numbers in the last column. According to the title, the first figure refers to the total number of reviews found (and the second one in brackets refers to the number of reviews that were rated as high quality).

   If that is the case, how do the authors explain the following pairs of figures: 2(8), 0(2), 8(19).....etc?

   If the opposite is true, how do the authors explain the pair: 16(4)?

Discretionary Revisions:
- None

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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