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Reviewer’s report:

General

The revisions have substantially improved this manuscript and will likely lead to an increased understanding of the results by readers.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

On Page 8, under "Data analysis," please change the introductory sentence "The 20 procedures of interest are shown in Table 1," to something that would explain clearly to the reader why these were the "procedures of interest." For example, "We analyzed differences in procedure documentation between the PDA forms and handwritten index cards based only on the 20 procedures that were present on both platforms," or something to that effect. It also might be helpful to modify Table 1 to indicate which are the 20 procedures, and what are the "other outcomes" that were examined (e.g. unstable patients).

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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