Reviewer's report

Title: Maternal and perinatal guideline development in hospitals in South East Asia: the experience of the SEA-ORCHID project.

Version: 1 Date: 17 February 2009

Reviewer number: 1

Reviewer's report:

Congratulations on presenting a vital part of research in the area of CPG development. It is fairly ambitious to research across different countries and cultures and I commend the authors on their hard work. It does not come out in the article but was their a variation in thematic data between the countries?

A) Major Compulsory Revisions
1. I was surprised that the authors did not interview policy makers or consumers in their research. Policy makers are a vital part of CPG development as they usually bring the economic and institutional view to the discussion and development and their voices need to be heard. I would appreciate a short explanation in the article why or why not this group of stakeholders were excluded. The heading of this article does not exclude policy makers and consumers as it does not specify the population that was interviewed but states 'in hospitals'.

2. Reading the qualitative data is very interesting and supports the analysis and discussion well. However, invariably the data is described as 'some interviewees stated ... with no numeric qualifier to it. It gives me the impression that perhaps only 2 participants made those statements but in fact it could have been all of them. While numeric expressions are not necessarily part of qualitative research, as a reader I would have liked to understand how many (n %) participants expressed views that were later grouped into themes.

B) Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract under heading background after first sentence needs to start with a capital 'H'

2. Abstract under heading background in second sentence I recommend to use the word 'guideline' instead of 'about their'.

3. The results of this research are quite similar to high income countries; in particular the time factor and it might be appropriate to add this to the discussion that similar findings had been made with high income countries, that includes the issues about CPG adaptation as well.

4. On page 14 4th paragraph starts with "Thought not often linked" did you mean thoughts? Somehow the sentence does not make quite sense and might benefit from rewording.
5. Under Background on page 5 paragraph starting with 'quantitative data from the baseline ...' Second sentence needs a reference to be added.

6. Under discussion on page 18 5th line sentence finishing with ...studies of similar settings... needs a reference to follow.

C) Discretionary Revisions

1. Background first paragraph on page 4 6th line and throughout the article the term 'multidisciplinary' group is used. In the AGREE tool and various other guideline development tools this is usually referred to as the 'stakeholders' as different guideline topics require different stakeholders and might not necessarily be multidisciplinary (although it often is). The term stakeholder also incorporates easily consumers of the service and organisations. The authors might like to think about changing this term throughout the article?

2. It is really confusing to read about 'recommended development process' throughout the article when in essence the AGREE tool is meant. It is really confusing to the reader who knows little about 'recommended development process' of CPG’s. Using and stating the AGREE tool instead or AGREE collaboration recommendations makes it so much clearer for the reader and might encourage the reader to look it up. This is only mentioned once in the article. However, if that seems to narrow for the authors, then it would be advisable to add a short paragraph to explain briefly some of the international recommended/accepted tools available for development AGREE, NICE, NZGG, SIGN etc. The Australian NHMRC guideline development recommendation are slightly outdated (1999).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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