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Reviewer's report:

The paper describes the comparison of the outcome of two CDSS implementing eleven rules for preventive care. The paper is well written and the topic very relevant.

Major

-------

1) The term "cloud-based" seems to have no relevance to your work (buzzword only?). Although one CDSS is remotely hosted and accessed via SOAP requests, this does not justify the term cloud-based, IMHO. None of the traditional cloud characteristics is used or required and you do not consider it a keywoprd either.

=> please consider removing it (or e.g. replace by "remote", "web/webservice-based")

2) Discussion: The discussion seems to blend two issues: list kinds of reasons for discrepancies and analyse the discrepancies in the examples. While both are important, they should be treated separately. E.g. analyse (methodologically) the results and then conclude the observed and potential kinds of reasons (local practice variations, terminologies, scope etc.)

3) Discussion: What do you mean by the chief limitation is the "lack of a gold standards for assessing the correctness of decision support systems"? Yes, medical correctness is laborious to assess, but necessary if this is the goal. But is this the goal of *your* work? Or is it the comparison of two systems - for which the lack is not a chief limitation? My impression: the latter.

4) Conclusion: You state "future efforts ... possibly with more complex rule logic": do you consider this a limitation of your work? While you raise the point, i.e. you consider it important, you to not discuss it or give the reader a hint on the possible effect: can it be expected that the CDSS differ more? Have you some indications from preliminary work?

=> perhaps move this to limitations

5) Conclusion: While the topic of our research is important, there seems to be a gap between the immediate findings of your study and your conclusion: Even if both systems had 100% accordance, there is required more until "cloud-based
CDS provides valuable advice...around the world”.

=> reconsider including recommendations for future research also by others (not only your hope to focus or the potential pause to reconsider your work)

Minor

-------

* p21 Reference 1: "[1."
* p27 Table 4: row 1 cell "95%..": hyphen is shorter than below
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