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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

A) Although it is stated that these are not systematic, neither exhaustive reviews, to be “reasonable systematic and transparent”, is crucial for the credibility of the reports and because it give the readers the opportunity to see the degree of subjectivity of this series of advices (see part B). The methods used to prepare the series of reviews are described in the introduction to this series. This is the weakest part of this review and consequently there are strong limitations in advices and suggestions given to WHO that should be put in writing as a disclaimer and be seen more explicitly, both in the abstract and in the text about it. Alternatively you could make changes in methods section. If you decide this option I recommend to describe:
   1. Search inclusion and exclusion criteria. Including language
   2. Bibliographic date base used and why.
   3. Organizations contacted and criteria to choose organizations and locations. How are being contacted? Survey to whom, why.
   4. Grey literature (which one?)
   5. Flowchart of the process to obtain the data and formation

B) SEE some important commentaries in red in the attached WORD version of your review (in track changes).

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

See also my suggestions in the text attached using the track changes tool

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.