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Reviewer’s report:

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?

Discretionary revision:

It’s not clear what is a new argument or new insight, as country ownership, the importance of local context, and demonstrating outcomes when it is difficult to make straightforward causal linkages are all old arguments, though they are certainly relevant. The authors note that these are not new concepts to the current efforts to improve governance, but it would be helpful if the authors identified what is new.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?

They make a good case for governance being an important, and is important to a public health and development audiences – it's not particularly a biomedical audience.

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?

Discretionary revisions

The piece is very descriptive in saying what is going on, but the argument for what is wrong with current approaches and what should be done differently is somewhat superficial, as many suggestions are made about what could be done, without identifying beyond the broad areas what they think is critical in a particular setting.

The example of the India fraud investigation by the World Bank is rather superficial – there were many unintended consequences from this action, and significantly damaged policy discussion and future investment – saying that it led to strengthening procurement was not the main effect (it probably led to better procurement monitoring by the World Bank, and marginalized their activities in the country for years to follow).

4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?
Yes

5. Is the piece written well enough for publication?
Yes
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