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Reviewer’s report:

This article does the important work of examining, in depth, the grant peer review process.

While there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the article, I found it very long and repetitive (particularly the results), with a very "flat" structure.

I think the article could be strengthened considerably if the authors identified the two or three (rather than eight) findings, or sets of findings, that they thought were most interesting/important/worrying and presented those in detail.

These might be, (just for example):

- Factors influencing the quality of review
- Factors influencing the fairness, integrity and objectivity of review
- Cultural considerations

The discussion could then focus on each of these key findings in turn.

The other themes could be summarised very briefly, without the need for illustrative quotes or great detail.

Minor

It was not clear from the abstract exactly what the focus of the article was to be—seemed to be about

- Exploring the effects of illuminating the peer review process (the focus of the background)
- Describing the process from the perspective of reviewers (the focus of the rest of the abstract)
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