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Reviewer's report:

Khodambashi and Nytrø have reviewed five guideline development tools (MAGICapp, GRADEpro, BRIDGE-Wiz, Håndboka, Internet Portal). The manuscript was revised and re-submitted. We reviewed the answers to our comments.

The authors added clear goals of the manuscript and additional information on their methods, which was needed. They did not, however, sufficiently change the structure of the manuscript to fit accepted standards. For example, the methods include sections that are more suited to a discussion, and the selection criteria are presented in the results rather than the methods. At minimum, the authors look at other studies published in this journal as a template to structure their manuscript.

Specific comments

1. The explanation of the structure at the end of the introduction and beginning of the methods is more confusing than helpful.

2. The many sections, and repeated explanations of the sections, are more confusing than helpful.

3. The beginning of the search is not stated, only the end date.

4. The following in the methods search section is not methods, but more like discussion, and is repetitive: Much research and development have gone into formalizing GLs to make them computer interpretable. The accompanying software development tools, or integrated development environments [11] support the encoding of guidelines to facilitate content-based search, integration of electronic health records with guidelines and most importantly, executable decision and process support. [12]. As already stated, we regard this as a later step of GL deployment and implementation similar to software development, and not relevant for the initial GL
5. The following should just be presented in the results, it doesn't belong in the methods: "Details of the identified tools based on the searched sources are presented in Section 3 (Results part 1)."

6. Given that the previous case study did not contribute, the authors can remove any mention of it from the manuscript.

7. A description of the selection criteria (methods) is described in the results.

8. Table 2 includes the source of the identified tools, which makes the table more difficult to read and does not add useful information.

9. As in the authors first submission, the majority of the discussion would be more appropriate if it was reported in the results section.

10. You acknowledge in the manuscript that it is "not an overall GDT ranking, since GDTs are made for different purposes and methodologies," yet mention that there should be standards for them.

11. Your summary table should be informative, whereas at the moment it reads more like section headings.

12. Table 2 is poorly structured - the "Organizations" column is a table within a table.

13. The tables in the manuscript should be describing the tools, the 13 identified themes, and whether the tools cover the themes. The rest are sufficient as supplementary files, as the current tables are overly comprehensive.
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.

No

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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