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**Reviewer's report:**

Synthesizing what works well, where and why from available evidence is useful for many health service providers, policymakers and researchers. This paper is clearly written, informative and of interest to these groups. I have a few comments that would strengthen the paper. They fall largely in the category of minor essential revisions.

**Methods**

I have noted the search strategy. Further detail would be useful & add to comprehensiveness and replicability:

- A table of inclusion/exclusion criteria. (This might help clarify the comment about not including rural and remote areas and specific sub-population groups. Several of the included Australian papers include rural, remote &/or predominantly Indigenous populations. Why did the study set out to exclude these groups?)
- A list of websites & organisations contacted.
- A flow diagram of paper selection.

**Results**

It isn’t clear to me whether the categories of ‘strategy type’ (Table 1) were developed a priori or a posteriori. Are these a result of the study?

**Discussion**

The discussion deals with important issues such as policy & practice context, and multiple levels of intervention. It doesn’t pick up the issue raised in the results about lack of sustainability of successful, time-limited programs. Do the authors have any further comment about this?

**Title**

I don’t think the title accurately reflects the scope of the study. The present title gives the impression of a much more wide-ranging systematic review. It could be expanded to mention ‘...best practice for chronic disease management, prevention and episodic care’; or even more specifically refer to diabetes care, Pap smear coverage and after hours care.
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