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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Although some search terms are provided it is not clear how these were combined within the databases listed and the search could not be reproduced by another researcher. The search terms and their combinations, use of truncation etc., should be listed for one of the databases with a note of how the strategy was adapted for the other sources.

2. It isn't entirely clear whether the authors were aiming for comprehensive coverage of all relevant US literature or a representative set of studies and this should be stated. If the former, the authors should explain why 1996 was chosen as the cut off point for the literature search and whether any efforts were made to supplement the database searches and reference list follow up with other methods such as hand searching of journals and other literature, and contacting experts in the field.

3. It is not clear how the data were extracted from each study or whether any quality assessment was undertaken. Was all the data extraction done by a single author; did one author check the work of another or were data extracted independently and compared? How well were the evaluation studies carried out and were there any potential sources of bias (eg drug company involvement) that should be considered?

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

4. Can the authors confirm that they are referring to 'Business Source Primer' as a database. I am not familiar with this and wonder if they mean 'Business Source Premier'.

5. Some typos and needs proof reading - eg
p.5 line three ' However, there appears that no...'
p.8 line three '....frequently evaluated specific drug management tool evaluated...'
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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