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Reviewer’s report:

Neonatal deaths, particularly in developing countries, have been highlighted as an important area of research by a number of international bodies and consequently the proposed systematic review will provide valuable information for future research to build upon. Given scarce resources for healthcare, which is a concern globally but is exacerbated in low income countries, the focus on economic evidence will be particularly valuable. The protocol is clear and follows PRISMA guidelines. I would therefore recommend the article for publication with the following edits to improve clarity, and subsequent corrections and revisions to the language.

I recommend that the following edits should be made:

1. The first sentence of the paper indicates the number of neonatal deaths is growing, however I would challenge the validity of this claim. The reference provided does not provide any evidence to support the claims made. In contrast to this claim, recent work such as that by Sankar et al. (2016) in the Journal of Perinatology, indicates that the neonatal mortality rate is declining. Please moderate the claims you make here or provide suitable references to support them.

2. The planned outcomes in Additional file 2 don't match those listed in the text on p. 6. Each item listed in the text should appear in the first column of the table with the relevant explanation and all items in the table should be listed in the text.

In addition I would recommend an additional review of the paper for English language and grammar which could be improved throughout. There are several corrections to the language that should be made from this additional review, some examples are as follows:

a) Throughout the article the word 'till' is used incorrectly instead of 'until' when referring to the time limits of the searches.

b) p. 4 line 70-71 reads 'changing patterns of resources allocation', should instead be 'resource allocation'

c) The NICE acronym is incorrect. NICE was renamed in 2013 and the acronym although still 'NICE' stands for National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.
d) P. 6 'Type of Interventions' should read 'Types of Intervention'

f) The authors should be consistent in the way that they refer to the different types of analysis e.g. cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis etc. are not hyphenated consistently throughout.

g) P. 8 the section from line 149 to 155 has numerous errors and does not make sense. Please revise.

h) When discussing the tools used to assess RoB (p.9) it would be clearer in each bullet to list the type of study first and then the relevant tool that would be used - as you have done in the final bullet.

i) There are a number of cases throughout where words are missing from sentences e.g. missing "The" before "Search strategy". In addition, word order and repeated words should be considered.
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