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Reviewer’s report:

You did a very thorough systematic review of the interventions. However, you need to improve the background of this paper. I would suggest something on the training for the volunteers and the tasks that they may do as part of your background.

On page 5 line 126 I am confused as to what you mean by actors. Can you explain further or use another term?

On page 9, can you provide some examples of psychosocial-coordinative support? Similarly, I think you need to define physical-cognitive support and provide examples. There is also the need for examples for psychosocial -domestic support and physical-cognitive activation plus social participation support.

On page 16, what do you mean by review was conducted ..."study"Local, collaborative...Effectiveness trial". Can you reference the author instead of the study?

Page 17 lines 420-434 talks specifically to Germany. Can you expand upon this and how it may apply to other countries? Otherwise, this paper should just focus on studies conducted in Germany.

Excellent job!

Please clean up the pieces as suggested above.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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