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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written and presented analysis of WHO’s quality assurance/auditing of its guideline development process. End-users of WHO guidelines and donors of the work will be interested in the findings of the paper. I have a few suggestions to provide more clarity to readers who may not be so familiar with WHO’s guideline development process. Hoping this will strengthen the paper and it's readability.

1. It would be helpful to include more brief details about how the GRC functions. For example, it meets nearly every month and is a closed meeting. People need to know that proposals are only presented in writing. Developers are not able to clarify points. Also, how does the committee arrive at its decision(s) ? Voting, by consensus, etc.

2. A link to the WHO website where the GRC is described could be helpful.

3. Weren't some changes in reporting made over the period of proposal submissions ? Earlier on, reporting on equity and human rights did not feature as much as they do now. This may play a role in the extent of approvals (or rather lack of..).

4. What was the distribution of proposals related to 'emergency', 'standard' and comprehensively scoped guidelines ? It would be helpful to understand the heterogeneity or homogeneity of scope of the guidelines. This may be a factor in the approval rate and time needed to achieve approval.
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