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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript on FRAM analysis and guideline development in the ICU. This study by Clay-Williams and colleagues is an innovative and interesting study that can be quite useful to understand and improve implementation of guidelines. The authors addressed the major concerns I had in the first submission however it is unfortunate that the edits are not highlighted in the text (either by page number/line number or red text). It was difficult to discern what the exact changes were. Nonetheless, the description and application of FRAM is greatly improved in this revision and much clearer, particularly Table 1 & 2.

Minor essential revisions:

1. The description in the text of Figure 1 & 2 is much improved however; adding legends to Fig 1 & 2 would be helpful. Being able to read the Figures stand-alone would be ideal and without a legend, that is challenging to do.

2. I do see that the results and discussion sections were separated but I think there is a lingering paragraph in the methods section that needs a header - the last paragraph in the Methods section starting with “Superficially, both procedures were well written….”. This appears to be referring to both of the cases and the overall process of FRAM but without a sub-heading, it seems to be only referring to Case #2.

Discretionary Revisions

3. For Case 2, first sentence in Results section describes that one researcher developed the initial FRAM. Is this common or best practice in FRAM? I understand that this FRAM was modified after team meetings with the clinicians but I suspect that fewer changes may have been needed if clinicians or other individuals were involved in the initial FRAM. If this is best or common practice, please indicate that in the manuscript.
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