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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

1. "All eligible papers were co-authored by a Triple-P affiliated author, apart from one" [24]. It might be better to introduce a note of caution, saying that in one or two papers it was hard to tell, because of lack of reporting of conflicts of interest. Or that 'they appeared to be coauthored...'. Of course, this is a striking example of the need for greater reporting transparency.

2. It sounds a little odd to say “and independent observers would not be expected to attend the interventions”. This should be altered, eg as below:

“.....interventions [10] and this may have led to a more positive maternal evaluation of the child's behaviour, reflecting more optimistic states of mind. Fathers are on the other hand are less likely to attend sessions, and independent observers are unconnected /OR not involved / with the intervention.
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