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Reviewer's report:

As a result of a major compulsory revision, suggested by both of us reviewers, the authors failed to essentially improve the manuscript. Some points have been addressed in the response, but did not find their way into the manuscript. This is disappointing. With my comments, I was not aiming at adding some references, but suggestion the authors to study the state of the art and use the experience documented there to rework their approach.

Comparing old and new manuscript, the modifications are rather some words than a comprehensive methodological improvement. With respect to my comments, a detailed analysis yields:

1. Improve taxonomy: Still, the terms are not defined clearly, and the chart mixes "part-of" and "is-a" relations. Hence, the structure presented is not taxonomy at al. referring to the Wikipedia definition of "taxonomy". What is the difference between warehouse and datawarehouse? Why can you distinguish anatomy and disease? Why are only micro arrays and neuroimages included, what with all other? ... In conclusion, the authors failed in this point

2. Process more data: It is mention 22 journals are considered now (initially 8, factor 3) and that 40,000 papers have been processed now (initially 10000, factor 4), and the number of inclusion increased to about 600 (initially 300, factor 2). However, 24 web links are remaining, which was the goal to detect.


4. Improve the interface: partly done in functionality, layout and usability was remained.

5. Self-critical discussion: this is not done, too. For instance, the authors argue that there isn’t any paper published in MI presenting resources. But, however, in my opinion there are much more, which are not detected simply because the title and abstract are searched only, and it is quite unusual to include the web address in either of this. If BMC would publish this paper, and the authors run their algorithm, http://www.gib.fi.upm.es/emir2 will not be detected. A discussion just stating “we believe, however, that …” is not self-critically. “not all journals belonging to the field of MI” – I and many authors agree, so why do you select this set disregarding any paper to the field? Simply including them in the list of references is not enough.
In summary, the methods that are lengthy explain in this paper are not worth publishing. The only information of interest is:

“609 MI resources are collected on http://www.gib.fi.upm.es/emir2, which is a free accessible resource collection.”

If there is a short paper or technical note format in BMC, I'll be happy to support such a note to all readers informing them on this web page, but I’m not able to support this manuscript as a scientific paper.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests