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Dear Mr. Adrian Aldcroft,

We would like to thank you and the reviewers, Prof. Chatzoglou and Prof. Rodrigues, for your interest in our research and for your efforts to promote more necessary modifications. This letter details the changes made to the manuscript in response to the comments of Prof. Rodrigues.

**Responses to comments made by Prof. Pedro Pereira Rodrigues:**

We would like to thank Dr. Rodrigues for the continuously thorough review of our work. The following lists our response to the comments (as originally numbered):

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

C5: Thank you for this comment! A quantitative example of the described results has been added to the results section of the abstract.

C31: We revised Tables 3 and 4 in order to make them clearer. We added two columns to each table adding the information of 'Total admissions when history was (not) viewed'. By doing this, we think that the readers could easily see the 100% for each diagnosis. We also kept the footnote again for more clarity. In addition, we changed the presentation from '% (n)' to 'n (%)' and we deleted the words "percentage of".

C32: We added in Tables 3-4 another column for the actual p-value. In cases when it was lower than 0.001, we stated '<0.001' as requested.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

C12: The references to the tables belonging to the results section were removed. The reference to Table 1, which is descriptive of the EHR IS, remains.

C18: The requested change has been made (page 6, under "The research method and statistical tools").

C24: The tables are now consistent, and follow the 'n (%)' rule (comment C31).
C33: The p-values are once again available in Tables 5-10. The footnote under Table 5 has been updated accordingly ('Table entries represent the odd ratio, with p-values in parentheses'). Additionally, again in cases that the p-value was lower than 0.001, we stated '<0.001' as requested in comment C32.

Discretionary Revisions: We are very grateful to have these comments also. We took a careful review on comments C3, C8 and C36, and we are more confident in our phrasing. In addition, we reviewed and edited the paper again.

We would like to thank Prof. Rodrigues once again for his thorough and comprehensive inspection of our work.

We hope that the revised version of the manuscript is now suitable for publication in your journal.

Sincerely,

The authors