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Reviewer's report:

1. Topic and Content Interesting and important
2. Scientific Reasoning and Argumentation serious concerns
3. Experimental Procedures NA
4. Do you feel the manuscript could be shortened and still prove its point? No
5. Language and Grammar OK
6. Priority No
7. Would this qualify as a Feature Article? No
8. Does this need statistical review? Yes if it would be considered as publishable
9. Do you have concerns about the appropriate treatment of animals in this study? NA
10. If this paper is accepted, should an editorial be published? Might be

Minor items:

- Introduction: there is no reason to cite the Han study, this was about an implementation problem, and not about content. About standards for a pediatric EMR, 2 are mentioned, one from 2006 and one from 2007. Is there not a more recent one? "This is the first study..." this remark is mentioned both in the introduction and in the discussion. Bit too much.

Also, their system AWARE is mentioned too much.