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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for your revisions of the manuscript. In my opinion, the paper is now much more focused an improved. All my original criticisms have been adressed by the authors. I only have two minor suggestions that may improve the readability of the paper.

Discretionary revisions:

1. In the background section, last paragraph, you refer to CCIS that is to be/has been introduced "The availability of information in stored patient charts may improve after the CCIS introduction...". However you have not yet mentioned that this study is part of a larger study. I suggest you move the sentence "This paper is part of a larger study..." from the first paragraph in the Rationale to aid the reader.

2. The same thing applies for the description of the Hawthorne effect. You introduce the concept in the Results section, but only give the references and explanations in the discussion, and readers that are not familiar with the Hawthorne effect may be confused. I suggest you move some of the explanation of participant reactivity and the Hawthorne effect from the discussion to the results.

Other than that, the paper is now much improved. You have clarified the aim of this particular study, adjusted the conclusions and abstract accordingly, clarified the relationship between this study and previously published results and discussed some of the weak points of the study more in detail.
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