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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer #1

Major

1. The introduction needs greater focus - we have added a sentence linking the history of NLP to the current study. We believe that the information in this history is important for readers to understand as they learn from this manuscript.

2. Duplicate sentences: The duplication has been removed.

3. Unique Concepts vs. As they occur in the record: We have clarified that the concepts were taken as they occurred in the record and no filtering for uniqueness was performed.

4. How many SNOMED-CT codes were used? This was not studied as part of this protocol. The study design was not powered to answer this question in a generalizable way. This can be the basis for future research.

5. Note the ranges of the sensitivity and specificity: Done as requested. The discussion is also altered to reflect the range of the results by section of the record.

Minor

6. The use of terms "record", "Clinical Record", "Medical record" were better defined as requested.

Reviewer #2

Minor

1. Lack of focus due to history of NLP paragraphs, a better introduction has been added. We have added a sentence linking the history of NLP to the current study. We believe that the information in this history is important for readers to understand as they learn from this manuscript.

2. Parenthetical remarks in the Methods have been removed if not definitional.

3. The Chapman results are a different comparison. The Chapman results are from a study of negation of findings and diseases in discharge summaries using concepts from the UMLS and as such represents preliminary work that we feel should be sighted. We agree that they are not directly comparable but as we do not directly compare our results with theirs, we see little harm in referencing their study.