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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded to all of the points raised in my initial review and have revised the manuscript accordingly and significantly improved the reporting of their methods. I still feel there are some limitations to the systematic review process (e.g. title scanning only undertaken by one researcher), however these are now explicitly reported and so the reader can make their own assessment.

The text and tables would benefit from a final "read through" as there are a few typographical errors and minor points to clarify. For example:

p4 second para, final sentence should read "are given below" or "follow" (not "are given follow").

p6 third para, repeat of first term in list of words searched ("case management")

p7 first para, second sentence. Clarify what is meant by "All searches were without truncation." (My original reference to truncation was concerned with using truncation symbols in the search terms.)

Table 1: "N/A" is used in addition to "?" What does "N/A" refer to? ("?" defined as "not to be found in the article", but also seems to be used to indicate uncertainty over some table entries). It would be helpful to clarify this.

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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