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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the importance of sharing these types of research experiences and I believe this manuscript may be very relevant to readers who are undertaking similar work. My primary concerns about this manuscript are in clearly identifying the objectives and structuring the methods/results/discussion. Comments are summarized below for the authors' consideration:

* Abstract Background: The introduction describes a need for guideline development but it does not explicitly state the intent of this paper. Instead it simply ends by noting that there are different ways to develop guidelines. It would help to succinctly make the case that a guideline specific to Australasian populations is needed and this paper reports on the process used to develop the guideline (for the purpose of sharing experiences/making recommendations for others/etc.). The Conclusion statement in the abstract suggests that the aim may have been to judge the usefulness of the GRADE and NHMRC processes. The introduction as written may lead the reader to believe that you will be presenting the actual guideline in the manuscript.

* Abstract Methods: Language related to a "hybrid" approach in the abstract to mirror language in the methods section of the paper would be helpful. Also, the final sentence does not appear to be a complete sentence.

* Abstract Results: See comments below in the Results section.

* Background section: In lines 16-35 on Page 5, the authors could help the reader more clearly understand how it is that bronchiolitis treatment is "well defined" and yet it is necessary to create a guideline. Lines 21-30 also include a sentence that does not appear to be grammatically correct.

* Background section: On Page 6 (lines 1-12), if development of a guideline that is appropriate to this Australasian population in an important point, I would expect to see this point revisited in the Results or Discussion section.

* Methods section: The authors very nicely describe the aim of the overarching project. Similar attention in this section should be given to clearly describing the aim of this manuscript (as it is distinct from the aim of presenting a guideline).
Methods section: The authors’ description of sequential activities was very helpful, but it is a lot of text to keep in mind while the reader is going through the section. A table or figure could be immensely helpful for the reader, as he or she tries to mentally track the various steps involved and the manner in which the GRADE and NHMRC planned a role at different points.

Results section and Discussion section: While there is a Results section in the abstract, the omission of one in the manuscript was notable. I think in outlining the aim of the paper, the authors can consider what constitutes Methods, Results, and Discussion. Also, formatting or numbers could better help the reader follow the presentation of challenges, advantages, and recommendations.

Results section and Discussion section: On Page 18 (lines 1-2), I expected to see some comparison with existing guidance from other countries or at least a revisiting of the comment from the background about why guidelines from other countries are insufficient.

Results section and Discussion section: On Page 18 (lines 51-58), the citation would be better used in early conversation about stakeholder engagement in the process, rather than with a comment about anticipated benefits. I would omit this sentence all together here and go straight to future research plans.

Conclusion section: There is some reiterating of Discussion content here. I think once the manuscript's objective is clearer to the reader, it will be easier to write a conclusion that flows from what the authors wanted to learn.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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