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Reviewer's report:

I agree with reviewer 2. this paper mixes a proposed plan for a project with a preliminary report of a pilot implementation. It is not ready for publication. You need some sort of evaluation, a survey, interviews, focus groups, something to establish what patients and clinicians think of this project. When you have this data, then this paper should be re-formatted as a research report rather than a discussion. Most people in the field know that this kind of system is necessary and a good idea. what we don't know is how to build it so more than 1/2 the patients in our practices will use it. That must be your contribution. simply building the system is not enough. You must document what you learn and convince us that these lessons apply to us as well. There are well agreed upon scientific methods for doing that. Without any lessons learned, the fact that you built the system and some patients used it, is interesting, but not worthy of publication.

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I have not competing interests.