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Thank you for agreeing to comment on this **Cochrane Review**. **Cochrane Intervention Reviews** are systematic reviews of primary research in human health care and health policy and are internationally recognised as the highest standard in evidence-based health care.

This checklist provides guidance on the areas we would like you to comment on, but feel free to comment on any aspect of the manuscript. In particular we are interested in your comments on the clinical context of the Cochrane Review. Standard Cochrane methods are described in the [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current) and the methods in this **Cochrane Review** have been assessed by an editor. Note that the **Cochrane Review** will be copy-edited before publication. Please observe the normal conventions regarding confidentiality in dealing with this review.

Further information on the Cochrane Peer Review policy is available from the Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource (<http://community.cochrane.org/editorial-and-publishing-policy-resource/cochrane-review-management/cochrane-peer-review-policy>).

**By submitting this form, you consent to Cochrane storing your contact details on our system to facilitate the peer review process. We never share personal data with third parties, all data are treated respectfully and securely. If you do not wish to be involved in Cochrane peer review, and would like your contact information to be deleted from our system, please email** support@cochane.org.

**If you have any questions or queries, please contact Tracey Remmington (****traceyr@liverpool.ac.uk****) or Nikki Jahnke (****nikkij@liverpool.ac.uk****).**
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| You should declare and describe any present or past affiliations or other involvement in any organisation or entity with an interest in the outcome of the review that might lead to a real or perceived conflict of interest. You should report relationships that were present during the last 36 months, including, but not restricted to, financial remuneration for lectures, consultancy, travel, and whether you are an author of, or contributor to, a study that might be included in this review. You should declare potential conflicts even if you are confident that your judgement is not influenced.**If a conflict of interest is declared, you should discuss this with the Cochrane Review Group before proceeding with peer review.** |
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## Abstract and Plain language Summary

|  |
| --- |
| * Do the abstract and the plain language summary accurately reflect the findings and conclusions of the Cochrane Review?
 |
| **Comment:**  |

## Background, Objectives and Methods

|  |
| --- |
| These sections have been previously published in the protocol of this review (available on <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/>). However, if you would like to comment on these sections or on any divergence from the protocol, do so here. |
| **Comment:** |

## Results

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapters 5 to 10*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/part-2))

|  |
| --- |
| * Is there an adequate description of the included studies? Do you get a clear idea not only of what the intervention is, but where it was delivered, when, and by whom?
* Do you have any concerns about how the data has been described or analysed?
* Is there an appropriate analysis of the possible risks of bias in the included studies?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Discussion

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapter 15*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-15))

|  |
| --- |
| * Does the discussion provide an appropriate summary of the results? Do you have any concerns about the authors' interpretation of the results?
* Are the findings set in the appropriate clinical or policy context?
* Does the discussion provide adequate detail about the completeness and applicability of evidence, with specific reference to the quality of the evidence and any potential bias?
* Does the discussion state how the findings of this review compare with other published evidence?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Conclusions

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapter 15*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-15))

|  |
| --- |
| * **Implications for practice:** Are consistent with, and supported, by the results? Can you think of any others?
* **Implications for research:** are they reasonable? Are they specific enough to be helpful in the design, prioritisation, or commissioning of research? Can you think of any others?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Summary of findings table

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapter 14*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-14))

|  |
| --- |
| * Does the Summary of findings table provide a helpful and consistent reflection of the review and make the key issues clear?
* Did the Summary of findings table help you to understand the review?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Additional/general comments

|  |
| --- |
| * Does the Cochrane Review read well and make sense overall?
* Did you get a clear idea of what the review actually shows regarding intervention effectiveness and any harms?
 |
| **Comment:** |
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| --- | --- | --- |
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| I agree to be acknowledged on the CRG website | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| Please include your name and any affiliation as you wish it to appear: |  |

 **Please return the full form to Tracey Remmington (****traceyr@liverpool.ac.uk****) or Nikki Jahnke (****nikkij@liverpool.ac.uk****) or via the link in the Archie ticket email.**