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Reviewer’s report:

I think that this article is worth publishing, but I really hope that the authors can take time and make it compact and easy to follow.

There are many vague positive claims made throughout the article. The only comparison made is to the conventional LifeLine model representation, yet starting in the abstract you speak about superiority of V-Model in general terms and constantly put plural "models" rather than model when making comparisons.

“It covers natural language problems (causality, non-explicit temporal information, and granularity issues), and is very effective for understanding a patient’s history”. - how do you measure effectiveness? effective compared to what? You have to make objective claims.

Or "With a novel graphical concept time frame, the V-Model innovatively resolves visualization issues of clinical documents. The V-Model successfully solves the modeling requirements and has better usability compared to conventional timeline models" - again models is a plural, yet you only compared it to one model.

It also seems somewhat unfair to use the term "modeling" in regard to the V-Model. V-Model is a tool for visualizing clinical information, not modeling it. I can see that there is a conceptual "model" of how information is getting visualized, but other than that modeling is not what V-Model does.

You refer to figures 1a in the article - however it is very difficult to see what you are actually referring to. The figure is very large and the information that you reference is not marked in any way. You would need to make the figure larger and somehow show how the "CT test was done twice..". Part of the figure is in Korean and part is in English - please translate all the figures to English, or don’t show the Korean parts that are not relevant - it is true for most figures.

The language of the corrections in red is often more poor than the original - it contains typos like "Natual", missed prepositions, etc, please spell-check and correct it.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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