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Reviewer's report:

General

The results reported in this paper are proof that of the scenario held by many members of the research library community - it takes a skilled research librarian to really find what is in the literature. Although the designers of search engines for the non-research library community would argue that the initial search reported here brought back creditable results, these results must be viewed within the context that you don't know what you missed. This paper stands on its own merits and contains a story which needs to be told.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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