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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, the paper is better organized and there are fewer errors than in the previous version.

Major Compulsory Revisions

I agree with other reviewers that review of other similar software is incomplete. One very similar system is called the Shared Pathology Information Network.

I remain unconvinced that an illustration of how information is integrated by caTRIP in the Duke implementation would be too low level. I suggest adding the following in the Results section: an example query from a user, the sources of data from which results are fetched, and how the information is joined. I believe such an illustration or two would add substance to a paper that lacks other results.

Minor Essential Revisions

Her-2/Neu should be written in a consistent manner. I found at least the following spelling variants: Her-2/new, Her-2new, Her-2/neu, Her-2/neu_, her2/neu, Her2/neu

Background section, page 4:
"Having as its initial focus on outcomes analysis,..."
Recommend rewriting this sentence as "Having outcomes analysis as its initial focus,..."

Section Implementation at Duke, para 1:
Please define what is the "Duke Breast SPORE"?

In the earlier section titled “Technical Requirements”, the description of GEMS implied it was a data system. In this section, GEMS is referred to as an investigation. Please clarify.

Section "Security: Authentication":
Please expand the abbreviation SAML the first time it is used.
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