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Title: What they fill in today, may not be useful tomorrow: Lessens learned from studying of Medical Records at the Women hospital in Tabriz, Iran

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments which have helped us to develop our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in light of their comments. Here is the detail of the changes:

Reviewer 1:

Comment: Abstract – mention the aim of these interviews.

Changes:
The following lines have been change in method section of the abstract:

Then, in order to combine objective data with subjective, 10 physicians and 10 nurses who were involved in documentation of Medical Records were randomly selected and interviewed using two semi structured guidelines.

Comment: Abstract – Result: Provided by?

Changes:
The following lines have been change in result section of the abstract:

There was no record in which all information was documented correctly and compatible with the official format in Medical Records provided by Ministry of Health and Medical Education.

Comment: Abstract – Conclusion: Mention the perspective:

Changes:
The Conclusion section of the abstract was completely revised as:

The Medical Records are expected to be complete and accurate. Our study has unveiled that the Medical Records are not documented properly in the university hospital where the Medical Records are also used for educational purposes. Such incomplete Medical Records are not reliable resources for medical care too. Some influencing factors external to the structure of the Medical Records (i.e. human factors and work conditions) are involved.
Comment: Method section: how was this done?

Change:
The following lines were added to the text:

   For this purpose, an alphabetically sorted list of all physicians and nurses who were working in the hospital was obtained from the hospital administration. Then ten physicians and ten nurses were selected using simple random sampling method.

Comment: Method section: mentioning some quantitative results like in 4.1.2c:

Changes:
The following lines were added to the section 4.1.1:

   Some sheets were missed; the highest number of missing belonged to the progress note sheet. More than 10% of the Medical Records were without progress note sheet (Table 1).

The following lines were added to the section 4.1.2.a:

   The unit summary sheet with the highest value of documentation (99%) and the Fluid balance chart with lowest value of documentation (52%).

The following lines were added to the section 4.1.2.b:

   The highest value of documentation belonged to the admission and discharge sheet (78%).

The following lines were added to the section 4.1.2.d:

   In particular those sheets which had been filled in by physicians, such as the medical history and physical exam sheet, physician’s order sheet and progress note all with 100% completeness of documentation of information (Table 1).
Comment: why this disciplines? How can it be, that they were selected randomly?

Changes:
Details about how the sampling procedure was done, was added to the method section of the manuscript as above.

Comment: In table 1 it should be made clear that the numbers for Group A to D represent completeness

Changes:
The legend of the Table1 was changed. Here is the new legend:

* **Percentage of the documentation of demographic** information: Unit number, Patient’s Name and Family name, Father Name, Date of Birth, Location of Birth, Address and phone number.

† **Percentage of the documentation of administrative** information: Date of admission, admitting Physician, Ward, Room and Bed number.

‡ **Percentage of the documentation** of diagnostic and treatment Procedures: Physical examination, Laboratory and Radiological exams, orders, medical and surgical interventions.

§ **Percentage of the documentation** of Identification information of diagnosis and treatment provider: Name and Family name of Physician and Nurse, Signature, Seal, Date and Time.

Reviewer 2:

Comment: Have the authors followed the journals' reference style?

Change: We rearranged the references according to the journal’s guidelines.