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Reviewer’s report:

Overall this is a clear and well written paper. The purpose is clear and well articulated. The paper makes a valuable contribution to clinical guidelines assessment. No ethical or competing interests are evident.

Discretionary Revisions:

The methods are clearly defined and reproducible. As far as I can tell the statistical analysis seems logical and appropriate.

It is interesting to see in the development of the assessment tool the different domains that were important to clinicians and other stakeholders. I noted particularly the “applicability” or similar domain was absent in the iCAHE tool and wondered if this is worthy of comment as if this is to be a useful tool for clinicians applicability one would think it would be paramount. Worthy of comment? Appreciate the authors may have restricted by word count.

I think it would be useful to be more explicit about the fact that the AGREE tool was not primarily developed for use by clinicians but for research purposes, particularly in the discussion section.

Do the authors see any practical limitations to the iCAHE tool due to the variability of scores presented by the novice tester, bearing in mind the tool is aimed at clinicians who would also be potentially novice assessors?

Minor essential revisions

Page 14 line 11 typo should read “there was full agreement” not “the”
Table 2 Independence domain Q22 should read “the views” not “The vies”

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare I have no competing interests