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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes

but they are based on a rather small population. The auteurs described a detailed comparing of Physician history taken and computer guided history taken. In the tables they described the items differing between the two strategies, but data had also be presented per patient. Probably the differences between the two methods can be explained by a few patients. Furthermore in an overall table (based on data of table 1) the same data need to be presented per organsystem leaving all the details out.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

the value of detailed information from the computer guided history had to be discussed in more detail. was there any check performed on the quality of the computer guided information? Check of the data with information from the general practitioner will increase the value of the study

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? zie pt 5
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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