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Reviewer's report:

3. Are the data sound?
The data and statistics are persuasive. However, a few lines describing a power calculation (explaining n = 50 in each cohort) would have been helpful. (Minor essential revisions)

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes. Of note, it appears that there is a table for each group of measures, except for triage note organization. Could this be added to table 3 if it keeps the manuscript within the size limit? (Discretionary revision)

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes. however under limitation 1, the authors argue that ‘the written record is what counts….however one can argue that from the patient perspective who do not see the written record immediately, the call conversation is what immediately counts. Therefore, glad to see that the authors address need to look at ultimate outcome as the second limitation. It would be helpful to tied limitation 1 with 2 with a transition sentence. (Discretionary revision)

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Two limitations are clearly stated. I would add authors should clarify whether the ExpertRN autogenerates any portion of the documentation. I had assumed not, but in the discussion section, the authors mention ‘CDS generated note’. If so, the CDS system, in a sense, has written critical parts of the notes for the nurses. In the overall picture, I am okay with this because the end result is better documentation and it is reasonable to assume that the all the documented points was actually discussed in the conversation; however, this will influence the statistical analysis. i.e. nurses who asked appropriate critical indicator questions but not good documenters are helped more with this system. (Minor essential revision)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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