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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached.

NONE

Minor Essential Revisions
The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. Para 3. The authors refer to ‘six articles’. Only 5 papers are listed. Is the Editorial itself the sixth article? May be useful to present a short overview of the 6 articles and their focus. i.e. Decentralisation in the context of Brazil, emergency HR planning in the context of Liberia, HRIS from a regional perspective etc and how these relate to the five areas from the conference.

2. Para 2. ‘the role of improving governance in solving the HRH crisis’. Could be read as a suggestion that governance will ‘solve’ the issue. May be better phrased as the ‘the role of governance in improving the HRH crisis’.

3. The URL to the KIT conference (2010) and presentations should come earlier and be a reference rather than in the text.

4. Para 5. May be better to read ‘political economy analysis’ rather than ‘studies’ so as to reference the commonly cited terminology of the tool.

5. Para 9 – ‘in addition, more effective….’. Is the WHO study referred to part of the series (i.e the 6th article) or a separate report that was not presented at the original Conference? It seems a little out of place with the other articles, yet is the only one cited as ‘forthcoming’.

6. Para 10. Would benefit from a sentence to describe the study after the sentence finishing ‘Campbell et al’. i.e. ‘In reviewing official development assistance to HRH through an analysis of UK government contributions’ or similar.

7. References. Inclusion and order to be tidied up. Would also benefit from full references to all 5/6 articles in the series.
Discretionary Revisions
These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential
NONE
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