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Reviewer's report:

The comments of all reviewers have enriched the current release of the paper; however I already have some comments to do.

Major compulsory revisions
In my first review I listed two major drawbacks of the paper: a discussion of the availability of tools to connect the analysed systems with existing electronic health records, and an explanation of the information contained in rules. Concerning the first issue, the authors made a copy&paste of my comment in the conclusions and it can be improved/changed. Concerning the second issue, I have not found any change. For instance, the “Study Limitations" section says that there are some gaps in current rule representations, but this assumption is neither justified nor explained in detail. Which are these gaps? After this justification, another step is to solve them, but the reader needs more information (and concrete examples) of these rules and how they are represented.

Minor compulsory revisions
Please, revise the format and some incomplete references (e.g. [26] [28] [41] [42]).

Discretionary revisions
None
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