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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent and timely article. Great to see transparent reporting of processes leading to WHO guideline development as well. I have only minor comments.

1- In the background, you say "rising levels of reports" of disrespect and abuse, but I would just be careful not to imply that the abuse itself is growing, but rather that more is being captured. You also say that respectful care is focused on staff values, but I would argue it also includes structural challenges, like staff shortages and lack of equipment.

2- Did you look only at facility-level policy, or did you also take into account any district or national level policy change as intervention? (fine if not, but perhaps specify?)

3- Can you include a bit more detail in the methods: languages included/translated, inclusion criteria (quant only, intervention only), was the search strategy peer reviewed, was the review registered in a database, etc.

4- Did you consider getting information from the AMDD monthly RMC update or the White Ribbon Alliance wiki page? Both great resources that could be considered as potential sources.

5- Did you only look at review outcomes related to care of the woman herself, or if she also included the experience of her child/family etc?

6- Was there any information about the timing of women's responses -- there are variations in reports of experience of abuse depending on when asked

7- I'm surprised there were no studies from US/Europe - could this be a result of the search terms; that improvements in care in high income settings (with malpractice fear) tend to be labeled as "quality improvement" rather than reducing abuse? if so, would be worth noting in the limitations.
8- Discretionary, but it would probably be worth noting if you found no interventions that aimed to improve care for newborns or families of stillborns/neonatal deaths. There may be some lessons learned on respectful care interventions from stillbirth studies, so while it is totally reasonable to exclude those, you may want to reference them in the discussion.

9- The plain English summary could be even simpler - readers may not be familiar with GRADE, for example

10- There is a blank citation on page 13
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