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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for their careful revision of the article. Most of the comments raised in the previous review have been addressed. The new discussion of the comprehensiveness of the CMA database is solid and the survey instrument is a nice addition to the text. Revised tables are clearer.

Major essential revision

1. The revised manuscript is clearer on how response rates are calculated and I understand the practical difficulties in reporting response rates based on individual guideline development organization. However, I am not entirely clear with the authors’ rationale for counting English and French versions of the same guideline twice. I understand that the CMA database assigns a unique identifier for French and English versions of the same guideline, but it should be possible to count translated versions only once since the authors report only on 630 unique guidelines in their analysis and results. Unique guidelines would appear to be the most natural and intuitive denominator for calculation of the response rate (one would not count bilingual respondents twice when doing a survey). I would therefore recommend that response rates be calculated based on unique guidelines, unless compelling reasons can support the current approach.

The authors have otherwise made a very nice job in responding to other comments and the revised article looks much stronger.
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