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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is a worthful and nicely reportent exercise. The authors report on using the GRADE format in one specific situation. There is an overlap between the GRADE authors and the authors of this paper. This is not wrong nor problematic, but the reader should know this as the paper authors can not be independent when judging the GRADE. I would suggest to clearly mention this on the Introduction or Methods section.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract & discussion section: After this exercise, do you conclude that the GRADE is good and can be proposed to be used or not?

Methods / conflict of interest: 3th line: "recuse"?? Do you mean excuse?

Methods / Formulating questions / 5th §: How did you take the asymmetry of diagnostic tests into consideration? In real life FP can either be much worse or less important than FN, dependent on the specific situation. (you correctly did this in the next paragraph.

Results, 3th § / second half: To this reviewer the second half of this § is difficult reading. Please clarify.

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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