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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors reviewed how guidelines are appraised, updated and evaluated in this paper. They present their search results and their appraisal of the situation in WHO clearly. The section on the value and timing of updating is helpful because often these scare people and lead to omissions.

Perhaps the evaluation section can refer to other methodologies that apply random allocation in more creative ways such as stepwise implementation. Because often there is an argument about the practical issues of withholding information from some clusters (hospitals or clinics). The authors could perhaps reassure the sceptics of RCTs that rigorous evaluations could be undertaken without withholding the intervention unnecessarily.
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Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
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Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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