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Reviewer's report:

I remain unconvinced with regards to the added-value of this review, which was my major comment previously. I do not think the authors have sufficiently addressed this point with reference to the two previously published papers on this topic (Pegurri et al. 2005 and Batt et al. 2004). I still find it curious that the authors do not recognise the contributions of these papers from the outset, i.e. in the Background section and state explicitly what is it that their review adds over and above them. Reference to these papers is still made exclusively in the Discussion section and it is still incorrectly inferred that these review only focussed on costs and cost-effectiveness. They could mention the fact that this review identified additional papers not identified by the previous reviews etc. I'm not convinced that a more specific review is sufficient justification however, given that the other reviews covered that ground and more.

They argue that their target audience is program managers, but it remains unclear to me how they would benefit from this review (or indeed the 'other' one for that matter!). Specifically, I don't believe my question "If an intervention is shown to be effective in one setting does that ensure that it will be effective if applied elsewhere, and importantly vice versa?" has been addressed. How have, or how do, the authors plan to disseminate the findings of this review to that audience?

Sorry to dwell on this, but the Batt et al. (2004) paper found that the grey literature was an important source of information and that is was not always of poor quality. My previous comment was simply meant to question that this review has systematically reviewed the grey literature, which is a huge undertaking!

Nor have the search histories been included. Although it is good to see the checklist has now been included.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review**: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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