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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed many of the points raised. They have revised the manuscript to clarify important sections of the methods that were previously ambiguous (particularly the assumption that they conducted a systematic review to inform guidelines).

Major Compulsory Revisions:
None

Minor Essential Revisions:
I do however still think this paper requires a case study to guide readers about the application of such recommendations. There is no point in providing readers a guidance (which will be the first of its kind) without the proper tools and information needed to apply it. This need not be a secondary paper or extremely large undertaking, in fact the authors could even walk the audience through a fictional study. The purpose of the example will be to guide readers through each recommendation. If it is a fictional example they can be creative to show proper and improper applications of the recommendation. The authors may wish to refer to JAMAs Users Guide to the Medical Literature as an example of how to guide clinicians or any professional really through methodological problems in research. I would think this addition of an example would substantially improve the paper and uptake in the clinical and research world.

Discretionary Revisions:
None

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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