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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to thank the authors for their detailed response to my comments and suggestions and for the revisions to the paper. I think this is very readable and well directed to the audience the authors are trying to reach. I have some further minor comments only:

1. The authors state "...they could combine the terms ‘treatment membranous’ with the glomerular disease search filter to improve the retrieval of articles relevant to this case." I understand the point being made but improving 'retrieval' may be better expressed as improving precision?

2. The authors stated "We then randomly divided these 39 journals into development and validation sets at a ratio of two to one respectively." it would be useful to discuss in the Discussion section the decision and effects of randomisation by journal rather than by article.

3. The authors note: “There is simply too much variation in the quality of accompanying search terms entered by the user, completeness of the database, and quality and consistency of indexing.” I wonder if the first ‘quality’ is required – I am not sure how quality is being expressed and perhaps it is really the variation which is the issue.
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