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Reviewer's report:

General
I find the methods much easier to follow now.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

page 5 - These procedures were not previously specified - should this be "were not specified a priori"?

page 7 - "Retrievals were declared “relevant” if the detected CPG fulfilled specific criteria with regard to content, language, and publication date (Figure 1). One reviewer classified the retrievals according to these criteria; these results were perused by three additional reviewers."
- please state if this reviewer was blinded as to which search engine produced the CPG. If they were not blinded, consider adding to your discussion whether this could influence your results.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Background page 3. When you state "engine is available that searches all guideline databases", please mention 1-2 of the databases that you are referring to.

Initial para in results is much easier for me to follow now.

Page 10 - discussion. I suggest adding something here about limiting the cpg term at scholar to the title field. This is not unnecessarily a limitation of your study, but a limitation of Google. Because Google has limited structure to its records, users cannot make limitation on publication type. You did the best you could with that limitation, albeit I think your decision to limit to the title field was an informal decision. It may be worth noting that PubMed plans to make their page titles more descriptive (see http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/techbull/current_issue.html), This will help Google; however, the PubMed announcement does not state that titles of articles will be used for the titles of webpages (seems obvious they should do this, but yet they have not stated they will).

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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