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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

I thought that the protocol was generally well written and outlines an interesting and unusual systematic review of quality indicators from clinical practice guidelines and the methods used to develop them. The authors have as far as possible followed reporting guidelines for the protocol (PRISMA-P) however, there are some deviations due to the slightly unusual nature of the proposed review, which the authors have acknowledged appropriately.

Minor comments:

* Whilst the nature of the proposed review clearly does not lend itself to a formal meta-analyses, I would like to see more detailed discussion of how the authors will compare the findings from the German and International guidelines they assess. There is clear information about data items that will be extracted from each guideline and for quality assessment for the included guidelines. Perhaps it is because this is an area I am not very familiar with, but I feel that the authors could give a more detailed plan for the data synthesis, for example, would it be worthwhile to consider including an assessment of agreement / disagreement between the QIs for matched pairs of guidelines or similar?

* I feel that the contents of the discussion section would be better included within the section outlining the plans to present and report results of the review.
Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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