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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your recent email noting in principle acceptance of our manuscript (MS:6299567961478922)

Attached please find our revised single manuscript for submission to BMC International Health and Human Rights.

In response to the reviewers’ helpful suggestions, we note the following changes:

Reviewer 1: http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/2017201381156863_comment.pdf

“The article is well written and although the list of major and minor themes is quite long the authors manage to keep the reader interested”.

- The two articles have now been condensed to a single manuscript.

Reviewer 2: http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/7609187761592996_comment.pdf

“The two can be combined together to make one global article, even if it would be little longer”

- As noted above, the two articles have now been condensed to a single manuscript.
- Previously the two articles with Tables and Appendix amounted to 47 pages. The current complete manuscript has been reduced to less than 39 pages.

“It would be useful to reflect on the point of view represented in the evaluation reports. For example, if the majority of evaluation reports come from projects funded by international donors and have a time-limited period to spend the funds and complete all the activities, I would expect them to be much more attentive towards management issues, booking, accounting, etc.”

- This issue has been addressed in the limitations section on page 30 with the inclusion of: “A case in point here is the emphasis on management issues noted in the current project. The emphasis on management and administrative aspects of CBR may in part be reflective of the time-limited nature of many projects, and the need to meet funder priorities and time frames. Similarly, it may be suggested that most evaluators have a strong interest in management issues, indeed many evaluators have substantial management background and experience.”

“Under methods, the choice of projects is justified by presuming that 2 years after Joint Position Paper of WHO & other UN agencies there is consensus in the field about meaning of CBR - I feel that this argument is weak. There are other reports from WHO (for example, report of WHO consultation on CBR in 2001, that show that this consensus was not uniform). Thus, in the results some consideration of different interpretations of CBR can provide more insights.”

- This issue has been addressed in the methods section on page 6 with the inclusion of the following text and reference: “Recognising that CBR is far from uniform [Reference...”
addred], the post-1996 time frame was chosen since it was considered that this would to some extent maximize uniformity of concepts, coming at least two years after the widely adopted 1994 Joint Position Paper [Reference]."

We have also taken the opportunity to re-edit our manuscript and correct a few minor formatting errors.

We trust these changes meet with your approval

Regards

Pim Kuipers, Sheila Wirz & Sally Hartley