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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you for this opportunity to improve the manuscript with the reviewers’ comments. Please find here our point-by-point responses.

Miria Correa

Reviewer : Stefan Darmoni

1) > I have read the paper and the comments to the reviewers.
   I think this paper should be accepted as it is a good piece of medical informatics engineering.
   The main point for the acceptance is that the reviewers did answer to most of the reviewers’ comments.

   Thank you !

Reviewer : Ronald Cornet

1) > The background starts with the product (i.e., result) described in this paper.
   That’s awkward. The first sentence of the background should be removed, the last sentence would better be phrased as requirements for the product.

   Done, the first sentence of the background was removed and the last sentence was phrased as requirements for the product.

2) > The methods section contains "materials" and "methods". Please distinguish those.
   e.g., "DHTML, REST, RDF" can be considered as methods, but S3DB is material.

   The Methods section was renamed Materials and methods and it now distinguishes materials and methods subsections.

3) > Methods currently doesn't seem to cover the methods for testing/evaluation.
   Please add.

   New paragraph was added at the end of the methods subsection (page 8, lines 193-196), pointing to original full subsection on testing in Results (page 18 line 429).

4) "The performance of the prototype can be seen in a video in the supplementary material"
   This is mentioned in the methods, but should be moved to results or rather discussion.
Done, this sentence was moved to results sections, more specifically for page 20, lines 487-489.

5) What would be good to add is a description of related work, e.g., orbeon forms (http://www.orbeon.com/). This would help readers to determine the added value of the approach described in this manuscript.

Thank you, we agree that not having included reference to W3C XForms formalisms and related initiatives exploring HTML5 presentation features was a glaring gap. Page 23, lines 559-562 now includes text to that effect, including citation of Orbeon.