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Dear Editor,

RE: Manuscript 4852768262299956

Thank you for inviting revision of our manuscript. We submit the revised manuscript. Our response to the comments by the reviewers and editor as follows:

Reviewer 1 comments

1. Information on number of information sources retrieved and flow chart illustrating numbers.
   We have added a new ‘Table 1’ (page 5) to supplement the Methods description with a listing of all organisations or sources that yielded relevant information. We searched several hundred websources in the sequence now mentioned more clearly in the Methods section. Given the complexity and snowball strategy for these searches, with one source leading to other of potential relevance which in turn resulted in some or none that provided relevant information, a flow chart is not possible.

2. Providing URL to references in Table 1.
   We have now added a new table (Table 1; page 5) providing URLs for all organizations or sources that provided relevant information for our analysis. We also provide URLs when available for the references cited.

Reviewer 2 comments

1. The title gives an impression that the whole available health information has been reviewed.
   We have now changed the title to “Essential health information available in the public domain for India” indicating that we cover information that was available in the public domain. We mention in the Discussion (page 24) that this is a limitation of this study, but also point out the importance of ready availability of information in the public domain for its efficient utilisation to improve population health.

2. Authors should have conducted a systematic review.
   Systematic reviews are appropriate for well-defined questions. Our review was a broad scan of the health information available in the public domain for India, which we repeatedly mention in the manuscript. Therefore, a systematic review is not appropriate for the objective of our broad review.

Reviewer 3 comments

Comment on the duplicate sources of information on the same indicators and how redundancy may be avoided.
This is an important point which we highlight further now in the Discussion on page 25.
Editor’s comment

As suggested, we have taken into account the comments by Reviewer 2 as much as possible. We explain above that the suggestion of systematic review is not appropriate for the objective of our broad scan of the health information available in the public domain for India as systematic reviews are appropriate for well-defined questions.

Other changes

The formatting of Tables 2 and 3 (previously Tables 1 and 2) has been improved.

We thank BMC for considering our manuscript for publication.

Yours sincerely,
Magdalena Raban
Rakhi Dandona
Lalit Dandona