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**Reviewer's report:**

This concisely written study reports the initial evaluation of a novel format of evidence-summary in a self-selected group of paediatric specialists. As such, it is the pilot of a marketing/development programme for a clinical evidence resource.

**MAJOR**

The study selection methodology appears to significantly bias responses to those who are actively engaged and interested in developing evidence-based information summaries. While no estimates of the potential population reached by the majority of the invitations, it may be informative to know how many specific respiratory specialists and members of the listserv were contacted to judge a proportionate response. Even if this is not possible, a greater discussion on this element is required.

The split of specialists represented - or misrepresented, as the case may be put - by the respondents is interesting and deserves comment. I believe haematology/oncology paediatricians are outnumbered by general/office paediatricians by around 50:1 ... yet these were an even 20% each of respondents.

The section in discussion regarding how the decisions to alter the structure were made/not-made appears to be more of methods/results and should probably be written in a different arrangement.
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