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**Reviewer’s report:**

I read the manuscript again a couple of times, then looked at my previous review. Some of my comments would be the same now as they were. The paper is well-written (Though there are many typological errors that should have been caught in proof-reading). I still think the paper leans heavily on South African experience and relevance and but the authors have argued reasonably that it has wider interest. I think the introduction is very good and the methods are commendably solid.

Unfortunately, my reading of the results section this time left me confused and frustrated. Instead of presenting a coherent account of the status, development, history and potential for allied health care clinical practice guidelines in primary care settings, I found myself getting lost in a welter of material that seemed to be about the state of allied health care in South Africa in general. CPGs didn't get a mention at all in the last results section. I can see the main themes as being logical and relevant, but the attachment to them of their respective subthemes seemed arbitrary. For instance, why is "advice" associated with "players" instead of with "guidance"? It seems that it could just as easily have been, and if so then the taxonomy of knowledge relating to AH and CPGs that the authors are presenting seems to be flawed: items should be classified in every set to which they logically belong. I didn't find the use of social network analysis convincing. I couldn't see a connection between table 1 and figure 1. Figures 2 and 3 are labyrinthine and I still can't work out what information they're trying to express.

To me, the authors know what they want to say but they're not saying it in a way that their reader (or this one anyway) can access. I think they should re-think the purpose of the paper, and if it really is about the status of CPGs in AH in PHC in South Africa, then focus on that in their analysis and ignore all the contextual material about AH that isn't really central to their topic. Maybe it's just me having a bad day and being full of the cold. But I liked this paper less than I liked it before.
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