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Reviewer's report:

The current manuscript revision provides good improvement in organization and clarity in line with previous comments. The addition of illustrative examples is also very useful.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
- In the abstract and text of the paper, authors indicate that patients were randomly selected but do not provide a scheme for random selection; please clarify, or perhaps using the term "convenience sampling" may be more appropriate for reflecting the mode of patient inclusion in the study.

Minor Essential Revisions
- It seems that with the addition of new illustrations, the numbering of the figures in the text and the figures themselves may be conflicting; quick review to make these consistent.
- In the results section of the abstract, seems essential to note that there were also items "captured" by the physician that were missed by the software, which also further supports the conclusions in the abstract and paper about the likely complementary role of the two strategies.
- The authors begin to consider potential reasons why the software failed to capture some issues; it would likely further strengthen this brief mention further with a consideration of health literacy issues - i.e. patients/lay people are not trained to "think" about symptoms and diagnosis as physicians are, which thus may lead to special issues with using this kind of software.
- on p. 16 in the discussion, authors note that the software had not been refined by clinical testing with patients, while the Methods on p.9 indicate that it was used by several 100 US outpatients; please clarify.

Discretionary Revisions
- on p. 18, the authors note that the combination of software plus physician interview would be useful and that there would be little or no demand on physician time; seems to beg the question whether any of the patients reported any issues with the software in terms of time required etc?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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