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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)

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In the final line of the competing interests “Thromblytic” is a mis-spelling.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Given the extensive discussion of it, I assume the lack of referencing of the Shekelle updating article is an oversight (Shekelle PG, Ortiz E, Rhodes S, Morton SC, Eccles MP, Grimshaw JM, Woolf SH. Validity of the agency for healthcare research and quality clinical practice guidelines: how quickly do guidelines become outdated? Journal of the American Medical Association 2001;286 (12): 1461-1467.). I would also suggest referencing the preceding conceptual article (Shekelle P, Eccles MP, Grimshaw JM, Woolf SH. When should clinical guidelines be updated. BMJ 2001;323: 155-7.).

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.