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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript presents an interesting review of a small set of studies examining PIC versus traditional care. The question is well defined, the methods are appropriate and well described, the data is sound. The discussion and conclusions are well done, and limitations reported. Some issues with the manuscript are presented below:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1) I cannot see in Figure 2 where it shows ‘reasons for exclusion at the full text stage’ as indicated in first paragraph of results section.
2) The participant numbers indicated in Figure 2 don’t match the text in the Study Characteristics section.
3) Since the studies are noted by first author in the tables and figures, I would suggest doing the same in the text. Using the reference number requires the reader to check references before knowing what to look for in the table.
4) There are minor editorial issues throughout the manuscript, including first paragraph of page 7, second sentence and a spelling error in the RA sentence.
5) Authors should review their designation of tables in the text. I received no Table 2, which is referred to in the text, and appears to be what Table 1 currently contains.
6) The appropriate reference is missing in the paragraph on Qualitative Data in the study quality section. Currently there is a [refs] there which I suspect means somebody was supposed to put the corresponding studies in there.
7) Appendix C indicates it is Key for Table 1, but it appears that it is key for Figure 1. Although the use of the GoFER Plot is interesting and creative, the key is quite massive. How will it be incorporated into the manuscript? Is it worth having this design when the information can be presented traditionally in less space and with no large key required for understanding?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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