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Reviewer's report:

I have considered the revised manuscript and the authors' response to my (and the other reviewer) comments.

The authors addressed most of my comments. For those they have not, they provided a justification. I'm prepared to accept those justifications.

My answer to the following questions is 'yes'
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
9. Is the writing acceptable?
I think the manuscript is ready for publication.

One small point:
Should ‘timely’ be changed to ‘timeliness’ in the following:
“… contributing to the timely and quality of clinical decision making.” P 16?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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