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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors,

The manuscript is generally well-written addressing a relevant research area related to CV risk factors and involved a considerably large search for relevant literature.

1. Please define acronyms on first instance such as CVD, HNWL, and CWL in the abstract.

2. Page 6: Search methods for identification of studies section: the authors state that search is up to the first week in August 2015. It is not clear why the authors searched up to this time (more than 2 years ago), please justify that. It would be also useful to comment on how the authors think the results would differ if an updated search including studies published within the last 2 years was conducted? For instance, in terms of the number of new relevant studies, size/quality of RCTs, the difference between HNWL and CWL programmes…etc

3. Page 9: the Data Synthesis section in Methods includes details based on the pooled results. I would suggest moving this to the Results section.

4. Page 10: is there a particular characteristic related to the design of the included clinical trials that lead to having 94% of the included participants women. Please comment on that observation.

5. Page 11: the Interventions section is quite informative, but is lengthy. I would suggest revising the text into a shorter section.

6. Page 8-23: The text "Error! Bookmark not defined" appears on several parts of the manuscript. Please revise.

7. Page 25 Discussion: the authors have highlighted some strengths and limitations of their study in the discussion section, but it would be better placed under a clear subheading to help highlight these to the readers.
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