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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers

We thank the reviewer for their valuable inputs. We have tried to address the reviewer’s comments, as best as we can, below.

Comments & Responses:

1) Abstract
* Line 25 - "using an iterative search strategy": Describing your search as iterative suggests that you will run a search repeatedly with incremental changes in order to successively move towards a desired result. Typically, you would build a search (ideally testing it along the way with studies you expect to see in the results) until you consider it finalized, and then run this final version.
Response: We have now replaced the word ‘iterative’ with ‘systematic’ to avoid confusion. We thank the reviewer for their valuable input.(Line 25)

2) Introduction
* Consider acknowledging other systematic reviews that have overlap with your topic and describe how your topic is distinct (this would be part of Item No. 6 of the PRISMA-P checklist):
Response: Based on this suggestion, we have added the following references to our introduction (Line 68; references 21 &22).


3) Data Extraction and Quality Assessment
* Consider using the EPOC Risk of Bias tool for RCTs as this would align more closely with the types of RCTs you will likely be considering for inclusion (available at: http://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/suggested_risk_of_bias_criteria_for_epoc_reviews.pdf)
* Line 112-115: The same sentence is repeated twice
* Line 123 and Table 1: Some of the terminology is atypical, e.g., 'cure rates' may be more commonly described as survival rates; 'relapse rate' may be more commonly reported as readmissions, etc. Consider checking some of these terms for more common language used in the research literature.

Response:

We have included the EPOC Risk of Bias tool for quality assessment of the included studies including randomised trials, non randomised trials, interrupted time series and controlled before and after studies (Lines 109,110, Reference 24). The sentence repetition has been deleted.

As suggested, the terminology in Table 1 is updated as survival rates & readmissions.

4. References
* Please provide links to the reports listed, e.g. References 1, 2, 6, 11, 18, 20
* Please consistently use the AMA format for referencing - here is one guide that may be helpful: http://guides.med.ucf.edu/ld.php?content_id=5191991

Response:
Thanks. This has been updated.

4. Supplementary File 2
* Consider working with a librarian to develop an exhaustive search as the current search would not be considered comprehensive, e.g., need to search variations on spelling (paediatric and pediatric); wildcard for 'children' should be child*, not children*, etc.
* Variations of spelling are not consistently applied, e.g., intersectoral care - should also search inter-sectoral care; cooperative care - should also search co-operative care; coordination of care - should also search co-ordination of care, etc.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for their input. The search strategy has been revised throughout to make it more comprehensive.