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Reviewer’s report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The authors have worked hard on the manuscript. However, this process has identified an issue of focus and emphasis that they now need to address.

The aim of the study (which is new in this draft) is helpful in defining the scope of interest, However, it also highlights one of the problems that the authors struggle with – [1] how much of what they report is a feature of GRADE itself, [2] how much is a feature of any new system that the users are not familiar with and [3] how much of it is a feature of guideline development in general. I can clearly recognise much of what they describe from my own experiences. In places they begin to draw the distinctions between these three issues – but if the aim of the paper is, I think to talk about [1] but they spend a lot of the paper talking about bits of [2] and lots of [3]. I think they have to more rigorously discipline themselves to draw these distinctions and talk about them clearly and more concisely so that the “take home” messages come from their data and are discussed in their discussion.

I don’t find their new title particularly helpful and suggest that they either try a declarative title or one that reflects the aim of the study.

I would suggest that the results of the questionnaire (that are presented as part of the reason for this study) are mentioned in text in the introduction, rather than the first page of the results.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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