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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript presents the implementation of the plan to integrate the quality of life (QL) registers in the clinical information system. The issue is important because QL measurement is currently a key element in the science of outcomes research. However its application to routine medical care is still very scarce. The rejection to accept spending medical time in the process of registering the questionnaires is an important hurdle that needs to be solved. The proposed solution seems efficient and easy to apply. However the authors fail to justify clearly the interest of the systematic registering of QL questionnaires in the medical care. They show that the developed application functions but their discussion doesn’t assume the need to explain how the proposed solution attains to overcome the existing obstacles to apply QL approach in clinical practice.

Please number your comments and divide them into

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  1. The objective (We therefore aimed to develop an efficient method to integrate quality of life information in the clinical information system (CIS) and thus make it available for secondary use) is well defined but not adequately justified. The introduction should include some comments to underline the relevance of the systematic use of QL and other patient reported outcomes (PRO) in clinical practice. They don’t enunciate the research question of the manuscript adequately. The key point is that there is an important problem to systematically register QL, that QL and other PRO are key elements in the clinical assessment of patients and that they propose a solution to overcome that obstacle and to introduce QL measurement in current care. I send some key references in this field.


Doward LC, Gnanasakthy A, Baker MG. Patient reported outcomes: looking beyond the label claim. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes 2010, 8:89

2. The main problem is in the discussion section. My impression is that the study is successful and it achieves the objective but the discussion and conclusions are not well balanced and adequately supported by the data. As the research question has not clearly formulated the discussion incorporates very few analytic commentaries. The discussion should address the way the authors have incorporated successfully the integration of QL registers in clinical practice. Patients’ adherence to the iPad seems good but the authors don’t measure it. We know the number of reported forms but we have no information about the rejected forms. The assess at the same time the use of QL for routine care and for clinical research but the main problem is not in research but in care. The added value of their solution helps clinicians to apply QL in every day practice.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Title needs to be improved including the term register. The authors show an efficient approach to register QL but they don’t provide a new method to measure QL.

2. Phrases 1 and 3 in the Background first paragraph are redundant.

3. First and second paragraphs of the discussion should appear in the results section.

4. Some references don’t accomplish the publication standards applied in the BMC journals and should be corrected.

- Discretionary Revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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