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Author’s response to reviews: see over
The authors would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for taking the time and effort to provide us with a second round of reviews and suggestions for the manuscript. We appreciate the comments and suggestions and they have helped to improve the manuscript. We have addressed the comments individually below and made track changes edits to the manuscript.

Reviewer 1: Knut Magne Augestad

1. The Authors have satisfactory replied to my suggestions for improvement. I recomend that the manuscript is accepted for publication.

   Thank you very much for this kind response, we appreciate the reviewer taking the time to re-review the manuscript.

Reviewer 2 Tim Holt

1. I am happy that my concerns have been addressed but did not understand the statement on page 8 'We did not create a central review protocol and followed PRISMA guidelines except for meta-analyses.' Perhaps this could be clarified?

   Page 8, paragraph 1: Thank you for this comment. The sentence has been clarified as the following.

   We did not create a central review protocol and followed PRISMA guidelines; however we were unable to perform meta-analysis.

2. Similarly, I think the end of the following sentence (page 12) needs rephrasing to be clearer: 'For purposes of analysis, we extracted data from 101 articles and articles containing the same intervention were only included once in the analysis 3 articles [25-27] and 2 articles [28, 29].'

   Page 12, paragraph 2: Thank you, we clarified the sentence below.

   We extracted data from 101 articles. Two sets of articles contained the same intervention and therefore only one was included in the analysis, these were 3 articles [25-27] and 2 articles [28, 29].

3. There are four instances where a sentence starts with 'And', but this is an editorial issue - no change required if the editors are happy.

   We have fixed this error in the following places:

   Page 20, paragraphs 2 and 3; Page 21, paragraph 1; Page 22, paragraph 1.
4. The review was conducted in North America where despite the availability of the technology, use of electronic health records is some way behind that of Europe. This makes the final statement of the conclusion sound dated, it is a conclusion that could have been safely drawn at any time over the past 20 years. A conclusion resulting more clearly from the analysis could be used here, otherwise the Conclusion sounds weak from a European perspective. For example, the statement at the end of the Abstract 'Asthma guidelines generally improve patient care and practitioner performance regardless of the implementation method.' would I think be much better.

We thank you for this comment and this is a very important point when considering an international audience. We have amended the conclusion to include more information on the asthma protocols as suggested.

Page 26, paragraph 1:

Asthma guidelines improved patient care and practitioner performance regardless of the implementation method.

5. These suggestions are discretionary. This is a useful and comprehensive review that will contribute significantly to the literature.

Thank you very much for your comments, we appreciate it.