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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for sending me the revised paper to review. The revisions have strengthened the paper in terms of its authority, the range of studies the review contains and the transparency of its reporting.

I have two 'minor essential' revisions:

1. While I can see that your quality assessment process may not have impacted in any way on your review's conclusions (either in terms of inclusion, or the weight given to particular studies), I think this process should be reported. A statement along the lines of "We assessed the included studies for their methodological quality using the CASP critical appraisal tool [add reference], but as this process did not affect either the studies we included, or the reliance we placed upon their findings, it is not reported in detail here."

2. I think you have overlooked item 10 in my original review. I think it's important to place reviews in the context of others in the same field. If there aren't any other reviews (and I guess you'll have found them, if there are any!), then I think this is a strong justification for the existence of your review, and a critical claim for its significance in the field. A sentence to this effect could be added after "Accounting for these should enhance the efficacy and scope of malaria control programs."
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