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Reviewer's report:

I confirm that the use of the term "standalone" in referring to "comprehensive" is confusing for someone who works on clinical decision decision support systems. But it seems that the authors do not agree with this advice. It is the responsibility of the authors to change or not this term in this context.

I note that the authors mention in their answer that they do not intend to try to extrapolate their findings to all clinical decision support tools. However, in the conclusion, they still use a formulation which is not clear to this respect. I suggest that they reformulate the conclusion in order to be more rigorous with their findings. They could write, for example, something like "The online drug information databases we have studied and which belong to clinical decision support tools, vary in their ability to answer questions across a range of categories".

Beside this two points, the authors have notably improved the quality of their article.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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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