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Reviewer's report:

The revised paper has been improved significantly.

Discretionary revisions

The added interpretation of your understanding of Web2.0 is rather narrow in scope. This should be backed up with some literature.

Or, even better, I would completely remove all references to Web2.0 - it is not much more than a buzz word - and slightly out of fashion as such as well to my understanding.

Also, your title, abstract and introduction imply that you have investigated a series of Web2.0 applications and concluded that Web2.0 in general enhances the personalised access.

This is not the case, so I would change these parts to better reflect your case study in your concrete setting.

Contrary to your belief that the political aspects are irrelevant to an international audience, I believe that it is actually very important for an international audience to understand the relevant aspects (and of course only those) of the Danish health system.

This is because from an international perspective I see two major roadblocks in using a system like yours:

Financing: How physicians/hospitals etc. are or are not paid for this particular type of work is critical. Assume a health system, that allows billing of phone conversations with a patient, but has no equivalent for online conversations. Will your system be successful as well in such a scenario?

Liability: Have there been resentments from hospital/physician side to use this system due to potential legal evidence of wrong advice? Is this a problem in Danmark (or this specific application)?

It is very relevant to have some understanding if these are simply not relevant due to the Danish system or if they are potential issues but you managed to deal with them. Therefore I would recommend to at least briefly discuss these two issues.

The final thing I would recommend is to further shorten and reconsider your
Your conclusion is more like a summarized repetition of your discussion and as such the weakest part of this paper. For myself, I find that the best way to write a meaningful conclusion is to simply answer the question: "So what?" in your conclusion and thus provide the reader with a valuable take-home message.

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.