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Reviewer's report:

Comments on the submitted manuscript "SciReader enables reading of medical content with instantaneous definitions."

(1) Comments on the manuscript content (Major Compulsory Revisions)

I have tested SciReader with some medical blogs found at Google and some abstracts from PubMed. Basically, the SciReader application is usable and works fine. However, the originality of the given approach is not very clear. The references are quite old and do not reveal whether the described problem is still up to date. Our experiences show that patients and other users ask the Web for definitions. A comparison of the SciReader approach to the existing Web is therefore mandatory.

What could be the added value of such an application? With Google you can easily find textual definitions, images and other resources that are not contained in the controlled vocabularies used by SciReader. "Mechanotransduction", "intestinal cleansing" and "bloatness" are just examples. If the medical content is - if at all - available as plain text, what could persuade the reader to upload the text to a free SciReader? A simple click on the unknown term, for example, is more convenient than entering a query into a search engine. The automatic implication of contextual terms could be another convenience. For single words and phrases, however, the added value is rather questionable. SciReader could be an approach to link expert knowledge to scientific papers. Such an application scenario seems to be more likely.

(2) Comments on the manuscript form (Minor Essential Revisions)

The manuscript is quite short for an original publication. 5 pages including the abstract, the references and additional files adversely affects the readability of the paper. On the other hand, the journal does not generally consider narrative review articles. In any case, a clear demarcation of SciReader to the existing Web would help the reader to better assess the pros and cons of the given approach.

(3) What's next and level of interest

I am not able to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions. The article may be important to
those with closely related research interests.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests