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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1.- I miss a discussion on how the questionnaires were created, and how were the different questionnaires for different groups developed. The rationale behind this process.
2.- It is stated that "the questionnaires listed key factors from the literature". Such statement should be backed up by some references (or is it essentially [16], the systematic review?). Was there any filtering of such key factors performed? if so, on what basis? What factors where used for each of the different groups (if different)?
3.- When the paper states that "a factor was included in the questionnaire if mentioned by at least three studies [...]", what there any rationale behind this "three" value?

Minor Essential Revisions
4.- Search and replace "HER" by "EHR". That's a common hard-coded Microsoft Word substitution rule, very disturbing when writing papers about electronic healthcare records.
5.- Tables 2-5 would benefit from a description of the values in its cells, particularly those that appear under "criteria" and "consensus"

Discretionary Revisions
6.- In the Analysis section, the paragraph describing the "tenth" and "twentieth" percentiles and how they are used. It could be rephrased, as it is rather dense, required a significant effort from the reader to follow. it could include some examples referring to Table 2.
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