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Reviewer’s report:

Competently executed piece of work - which although not of major importance to the field - is well reported and probably merits publication.

Most of my comments are minor.

Essential:
1) You should say whether participants were paid.
2) More background on the Cochrane Collaboration was required. The reader needs to be told a little bit more about how the Cochrane Collaboration works. For example, you note that participants assumed that all information accessed from the site was Cochrane approved. You need to say more about the approval process.
3) Where possible avoid saying 'many' in talking about what number of participants identified a problem. Give figures.

Discretionary:
1) The "honeycomb" model is, in effect, a list of topics. Presenting the topics as labels inside hexagons does not aid understanding and you should therefore remove Figure 1.
2) You should consider whether it is worth reporting specific observations about aspects of the site that were changed after Test 1.

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.
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