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Reviewer’s report:

1. Question well defined? Yes
2. Methods appropriate and well defined? Yes
3. Data sound? Yes. While there are probably many such programmes which have not been included, possibly because they have not been published widely and therefore not picked up in the searches, I am a little surprised that the “Family Partnerships” programme, a British partnership programme and which has been rolled out across Western Australia, was not included.
4. Meet relevant standards re reporting etc.? Yes
5. Discussion and conclusions well balanced and supported? Yes
6. Limitations discussed? Yes
7. Acknowledgment of work of others? Yes
8. Title and abstract reflect paper? Yes
9. Writing acceptable? There are several grammatical and typing errors that need fixing.

I have enjoyed this paper. It is easy to read, and provides description of its target programmes. I am not so sure that “critical” is a word that should be used, though. The paper is descriptive, but no less important for that.

I suggest publication once the minor errors have been corrected, and that it be termed a descriptive, rather than a critical paper.
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