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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Professor Irene Pala, Professor Giulia Mangiameli, Arlene Pura,

Accompanying this letter, in which we respond to the editorial comments, is the revised version of our manuscript. We again appreciate the editor’s suggestions which have helped us in sharpening and shortening the manuscript. In addition, we feel that the most recent changes are still in line with earlier changes as requested by the reviewers. In the table below, we address the editor comments.

We hope this has now made the article more concise and suitable for BMC medical informatics and decision making. We wish to thank you and the reviewers for all your constructive comments. We are looking forward to your response.

Kind regards on behalf of the authors,

Jobke Wentzel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Editor’s comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The authors were very responsive to the reviewers' critiques. I appreciated the authors' detailed description of their methodology and application directly to building functional requirements as the goals of these approaches and reporting of the results is not necessarily to generate generalizable knowledge but is anchored to the a specific software development need.</td>
<td>The reviewing process made us aware of inconsistencies and incompleteness of our writings. We hope the manuscript is clear and concise as it is now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 However, we have noticed that in this new version you are presenting too much information, with duplicate data in both text and tables. We would therefore be grateful if you could reduce the length of the article, prioritizing which information elements are critical to keep in the paper.</td>
<td>We have shortened the paper by removing duplicate descriptions, tables and examples in the text. We propose to take up some of the removed content as additional files (former Table 1, and the full list of requirements as previously described in the results section; additional file 1 and 2). This way, the paper is shortened (and more readable), but interested readers could still access the data to get an idea of the (detailed) results of the methods used. In addition, various redundant phrases and words were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Journal format</td>
<td>Again, we revised the manuscript’s formatting to ensure it fits BMC’s formatting guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>