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Reviewer’s report:

The authors should be commended for addressing each and every comment & suggestion. The final version of the manuscript is a very substantial improvement.

Major compulsory revisions: none

Minor essential revisions: In your conclusions (both abstract and text), you seem to imply a cause and effect relationship between your intervention (the CDS for VTE prophylaxis) and the outcome (e.g. increased use of appropriate and any prophylaxis). For example, in the abstract, "The CDS intervention increased "recommended" and "any" VTE prophylaxis..." and in the body of the text "... significant increases in VTE prophylaxis resulting from a CDS intervention ..." However, given the quasi-experimental study design, it not possible to draw such a conclusion. Indeed, the concurrent educational intervention, sales and marketing by pharmaceutical manufacturers, and increase awareness brought about by local and national campaigns to improve VTE prophylaxis might have had a great(er) influence on the outcomes observed. This wording needs to be cleaned up a bit as the increases in VTE prophylaxis can't be solely attributed to the CDS system ... but rather you can conclude that an increase in VTE prophylaxis occurred during the time periods after the CDS was introduced and the CDS is likely to have had a positive influence on VTE prophylaxis rates.

Discretionary Revisions: No additional recommendations.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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