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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for your revision! Please allow me to raise still a concern on your methodology, based on your „Authors' Response to the Review Comments“:

Ad 1 and lines 101-104 of manuscript:

Japanese guideline was just an example, I did not check all countries. As you highlighted South Korea adopting its name I checked the web by occasion for a GL there and found a Korean Medical Guideline Center with obviously presenting a short GL on the therapy of urinary stones as well (http://guideline.or.kr/guideline/guide/contents.php?number=25&F_sid=502)

You explain the methodology as „....The webpages of all 61 members were analysed..". Indeed you did not check all 131 countries members of SIU are coming from but only those 61 countries represented by delegates (which means usually that there is a minimum amount of members coming from the particular country).

Suggest you

* adopt your methodology (e.g.: „....The webpages of all 61 members represented by delegates were analysed..") and

* either address all countries once more, or adopt the results (lines 149ff, 307ff) and limitations not only to linguistic difficulties but also difficulties by different fonts /scripts / writings.

* All my other concerns where well addressed, thanks!

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

No

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

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

Yes

**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

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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