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Dear Editors

Attached please find our revised manuscript. We are grateful for the thorough review process; the comments were very helpful and increased the quality of our paper. Below you will find a point-by-point list of replies to the reviewers’ concerns. All changes in the manuscript are in red.

We hope that the revised version of the manuscript will be suitable for publication.

Kind regards

Thomas Ostermann

**Point-to-point-reply:**

**Vera Brandes:**

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

Page 10 (Indications and patients) - The 4th word in line 6 (and) should be eliminated

Authors: Done as requested

Page 10 (Legal aspects) - Line 9 should read: in the publications from AUSTRIA, Australia and USA there ....

Authors: Done as requested

**Discretionary Revisions:**

“…we need to point out more clearly what the differences are between interventions coined as „active music therapy“ versus „receptive music therapy“….And it is crucially important to inform the health care community about the differences between the methods “

Authors: We are very thankful for the detailed comments and have added respective sentences in the sections “Settings and Interventions”.

“I recommend to Schmid and Ostermann to state the limitations of their overview more clearly and to address that the propagation of HBMT will ultimately not only depend on the proof of cost-effectiveness, but on the therapeutic effectiveness which can only be improved by a broader spectrum of well-researched interventions and well-informed health care practioners that know about them. This, of course, applies not only to home base music therapy but to all music interventions currently practised in clinical settings.

Authors: Again the comment is very helpful. We have added a new chapter “Limitations” in the discussion part of the paper. Additionally we have picked up some of the remarks concerning future research in the “Conclusions”
Felicity Baker:

Major Essential Revisions:

a) The authors present an important overview of the literature however they could pose the question a little bit more clearly. The word “indication” doesn’t seem to actually best represent what the authors are trying to establish with their review.

    Authors: We have deleted the word “indication” throughout the paper

b) One aspect I’d like the authors to consider is that they don’t present a very strong argument for why this review is important. I think it is based on my own knowledge, but this doesn’t come through in the article. Be stronger in arguing for the value of this review. Also see my comments re discussion section which relates to this point as well.

    Authors: Thank you for this hint. We now have added more general aspects why the review is important in the “Conclusion” part.

c) Generally the discussion is well put together however I would like to see a further discussion of any recommendations they could propose based on their findings – this could be directed towards music therapists and/or health-care providers. I.e., what is the point of doing this unless some recommendations for future practice/research etc are more clearly discussed.

    Authors: We now have added recommendations for future research and for differentiated music therapy approaches in the “Discussion” and “Conclusion” part.

d) Limitations of the study are absent from this review. I consider this important in systematic literature reviews. Eg what about articles in foreign languages, much data might be missing eg Japan is well known for publishing outcome based studies. There might be research missed there.

    Authors: The comment is very helpful. We have added a new chapter “Limitations” in the discussion part of the paper discussing for instance the exclusion of publications from Asia and the question of completeness.

e) The writing is generally acceptable. There are a number of “German” English sentence structures which need to be addressed, specifically the sentences that begin “Especially…” which are frequently used.

    Authors: We have deleted the “german English” whenever possible. We also made a final language polishing by a native speaker.

f) -Also p.4, beginning of final paragraph “On this background…” please attend to this sentence.

    Authors: We have changed this sentence.

g) -P. 5, last sentence before Methods section begins. “Therefore it is of interest…” please revise this.

    Authors: Done

h) -P. 6 “pre-especially designed data form” what about “a pre-determined checklist” or “specially designed data checklist” or something like this.
Authors: Done

i) -P.11, first sentence of “discussion”. Please revise English expression

Authors: Done

**Editorial comments:**

We recommend that you copyedit the paper to improve the style of written English.

Authors: We have deleted the “german English” whenever possible. We also made a final language polishing by a native speaker.

Please include a 'Competing interests' section between the Conclusions and Authors’ contributions.

Authors: We included a “Competing interests” section.

Please include an Authors' contributions section before the Acknowledgements and Reference list.

Authors: We included an Authors' contributions section.

We strongly encourage you to include an Acknowledgements section between the Authors’ contributions section and Reference list.

Authors: We included an Acknowledgements section.