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Author's response to reviews:

We have reviewed each comment and have attempted to address each one thoroughly and appropriately. Below is a listing of changes made to the manuscript as well as our specific responses to comments made by the reviewers:

Reviewer 1

1) A reference was added (#6) for the HITECH Act.

2) A description of the Likert scale was added. It was placed in Methods (Data Collection -> Instruments) section and reads as follows: “Of note, only a 0 (not needed) or 6 (absolutely necessary) score was given a categorical description. Scores between these extremes (1-5) were exclusively numerical in nature.”

3) The sentence referring to free-text information was deleted.

4) The phrase “viewer platform” was replaced with “human-computer interface” throughout the manuscript.

5) A discussion regarding “routine clinical decisions” and the role that “routine” may have played in survey results has been added as the second to last paragraph of the Discussion section. It reads as follows: Another limitation of this study involves asking respondents to rate the importance of data items in helping make “routine clinical decision”. We are aware that there are often times when clinical needs reach beyond the scope of what would be considered “routine” and require a different data requirement. It would be difficult to speculate the change in ratings, if any, if the word “routine” were removed from the survey. Regardless, we wanted the results of the survey to portray the ideas of providers in the most common and frequent clinical scenarios and designed the survey as such. We feel that options for viewing different levels of data density, as discussed earlier, would be a way to overcome this obstacle and provide adequate levels of data catered to each clinical situation.

Reviewer 2
1) The Han study has been deleted from the Introduction.

2) Another literature search was performed and failed to identify any more recent article focusing on standards for pediatric health information technologies. As a result, no further reference was added to the manuscript.

3) After reviewing the manuscript we were only able to find one reference to “This is the first study…” or something else related. As a result, we left that sentence in the Discussion as is.

4) We have removed all reference of AWARE in the Discussion section. We have kept references to AWARE as they currently are in the Introduction.

5) In an effort to validate study methods and analyses, the following statement was added to the Methods (Statistics) section: Study format, design, and statistical analyses were done in accordance with similar published studies performed at our institution and under the guidance of statistical support [12, 21].