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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a research protocol for a systematic review of the feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness of young people specific, integrated out-of-hospital services. Given that the need for specific services for young people (i.e. not adults or children) is being increasingly recognised, this review is both timely, relevant and important.

I encourage the authors to submit a modified version after taking into account the comments below:

1. Acknowledgement of the disease burden in young people would add weight to the reasoning behind doing the review: http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(11)60512-6/abstract

2. I recommend adding more detail in the quality appraisal/strength of cumulative evidence sections - including all studies regardless of their quality assessment is all well and good, but it would be beneficial to include more specific tools used to conduct quality appraisals (Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for RCTs, ROBINS-I for non-randomised evaluations etc). From experience of using the ROBINS-I tool, I would recommend conducting quality appraisals for non-randomised studies in pairs, rather than two reviewers independently appraising studies and then assessing again after discussion.

3. I would like to see more consideration of the issue of content - the feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness of a particular intervention is surely heavily dependent on the environment in which it is applied. I would anticipate that this review will span many different contexts as it includes studies conducted all over the world, with no exclusion on study country. Moreover, the context that young people (10-24 years of age) have across cultures is highly variable.

4. In the 'Data Synthesis and Analysis' section use of quantitative data analysis is vague - I understand that the review will undoubtedly generate a range of outcomes, and meta-analyses will not be feasible in many of these cases, but additional detail on what reviewers will use to judge suitability for quantitative data pooling would be beneficial. 'Means and standard deviations' surely does not suffice. This point should be clarified in the abstract too.

5. Some mention of stratification by disease area/health service provider would be beneficial - as alluded to in my earlier comment regarding context, looking at the entire care pathway that
young people experience seems huge and difficult to imagine; do you anticipate seeing more studies on particular issues, e.g. mental health, sexual health?

6. The review would benefit from additional clarification on what types of intervention the team anticipate - 'outcomes related to effectiveness, feasibility and acceptability of health services' is very broad, and means that the overall focus of the review is somewhat vague.
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