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Reviewer: Ann McKibbon

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the questions are appropriate and well formed.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Methods are good.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. Quite thorough.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes. Some editing things below that indicate some laxness in the document but these are mostly in the style and writing.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Please put in a concise section on limitations and strengths.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   I think the title could be expanded to include more information. I would also like to see the abstract strengthened and lengthened. Researchers and others interested in this paper would benefit from more data. For example the 15 steps in Table 2 would be useful if listed here.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes but problems with too many abbreviations and very inconsistent use of them.
I would suggest taking out about half of them and then using the ones that are
left consistently.

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but
which the author can choose to ignore)

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use
of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

See my comment above with respects to fewer abbreviations and consistent use
of the ones that you do use. Strengthening the abstract should also be done

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a
decision on publication can be reached)

To the editors: Nothing private.

To the authors:
All minor essential revisions.

2. Page 3 Background: What is “rather”? Not needed. It is either difficult or not.

3. Page 3 Third paragraph: please used TAT.

4. Page 4 More need of TATs. This is the final time I will list the need for use of
TAT. Use your find feature to help get to consistency for abbreviations.

5. Page 6 Pubmed is a front end to the Medline database and not a database
itself. Minor point but important.

6. Page 6 “…users are medical staff and patients.” Are you sure that all users are
medical? Are nurses, allied health workers, etc involved? If so, would “hospital”
or clinical or some other term be more appropriate?

7. Page 6 missed a HIS abbreviation….

8. Page 8 Your listing of order…laboratory (19), radiloyg (11) followed by…whole
clinical”. Should the whole clinical come first?

It should start in the results section. The discussion section, in my understanding
is only used to discuss what you have already presented in your results section.
Therefore please consider putting something about dates in the results section.

10. Good job on the citations. Citation 10—does it have an issue number?
Citation 22. Needs more information such as the data of access and the title of
the site. Citation 98. Starts funny.

11. I also like the charts. Very useful presentation of data.

12. In summary, a very nice paper that will be even better with a good proof read
and some movement of data.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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