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Reviewer's report:

The paper clearly describes the innovative web-based browser for searching objectives across medical disciplines and societies. The topic is relevant, up-to-date and quite challenging. Let me have the following comments/questions, which I hope could improve the paper:

Background section represents introduction to the paper domain. I miss just a brief state-of-the-art or references of related publications (paper and conference contributions) in last few years. Are there any similar results, which have been already published?

Construction and content section represents the methods. There are only a brief information about the data format and processing of individual objective sets, which were stored in a database.

- Did authors do any data pre-processing/optimization before the import into system database was done?

- How the original data look like? Any example of diversity?

- Were there any inconsistencies and missing values?

- What type of database did authors use and why (MySQL, PostgreSQL, ...)?

- What is data model of designed database?

- What hw (server specification), sw (framework, data processing and modelling tools) and programming languages were used during the development and implementation?
- How the authors generate a list of medical discipline? It is predefined or standardized list?

Utility and discussion section represents the results and discussion. From my opinion, the utility (results) should deserve more space to mention main characteristics and features of developed browser. I propose to split this particular section into two separate parts and describe in detail achieved results. May be some typical use case introducing the browser usage in practice could be mention here.

- Did the authors consider to use any standardized classification for individual objective (e.g. Bloom's taxonomy)? If no, please, explain why.

In general, the authors did a great work. I have found this open access database very promising, but unfortunately the paper brings only superficial description (4 pages of text excluding figures and tables). I think the paper need to be extended because of paper topic seems to be very interesting.

From the formal perspective:

- Table 1 is not referred in the text.

- Sometimes the abbreviations of societies are missing (e.g. Association of American Medical Colleges, page 3 row 24).

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.

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

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal