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Reviewer's report:

Most of my comments have been addressed satisfactorily. I have a few minor additional comments.

The rationale for the outcome of this review being antimicrobial use rather than AMR has been added to the methods section, but I think it would be better placed in the introduction. It could also be added to the limitations section of the discussion.

The description of the EPOC criteria has been added but it may be preferable to use 'units' rather than 'sites'. I presume the criteria of at least two intervention and two control units will also be applied to the RCTs and non-randomized controlled trials?

I think lines 167-169 belong in the intervention section ("However, the policy must be enacted by a government to be eligible; a study evaluating the impact of an audit and feedback program developed by a single hospital or even a network of healthcare facilities would not be eligible.")

Item 7 of the PRISMA-P checklist has not been completed.

There are also a few small consistency issues. For e.g. line 86: Staphylococcus aureus is spelt out in full but not Clostridium difficile. Line 129 and 142 refer to an additional file and a supplementary file: are these the same thing?

There is a rouge question mark in line 330.
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