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Reviewer's report:

Overall I am happy with the changes and comments that the authors have made. I have just one final comment to make regarding my original point 1 under Major compulsory revisions.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Originally MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

Original TJ: 1. There is some confusion over the main purpose of the survey when moving from the Background, paragraph 5 to the Results section, Survey responses to questions about the Clinical Answer, paragraphs 2 & 3, the Limitations and then on to the Conclusions. Is this survey just to test the format of the CA or is the content also being tested in some way? Has any separate work been carried out on the content of the CA? This does need to be corrected but hopefully should be about clarification and not involve too much time

Reply from authors • This was added to the background: “The purpose of the survey was to test the format of the CA, not the particular clinical content of the example used (for example, the survey included questions on the amount and type of information presented, but not whether the clinician agreed with the recommendations for treating bronchiolitis or methodology in producing the clinical answer content).”

Second TJ RESPONSE: I think I would feel happier if the first sentence, first paragraph in the Conclusions read more like ‘The results of this survey have shown us that the level of detail in the clinical content and format of the CA…’ or something similar, if the actual clinical content is not being tested.

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.
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