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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed my comments. I thank them for taking the comments on board and editing or responding as they saw fit.

I thought that there were major improvements to the presentation of the items. I suspect that there will be differing views amongst readers of this manuscript on the level of detail that is suitable, but I personally think the authors have struck the right balance given that this is reporting on the development of the tool. A slimmed-down, user-friendly version of the tool (as in Appendix 1) can be reported anywhere - they could just post it on their website without going through peer review! This manuscript is - and should be - a documentation of the development of the items, and requires a certain amount of detail to make the rationale for and utility of each item clear.

I also appreciated the extensive section in the discussion about the value it added to their own substantive review, and possible future uses of the tool. I think that it will help readers to determine the usefulness for their own work.

I spotted one or two minor typos (e.g., "complimentary" rather than "complementary"), so a light edit will be required before publication.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
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