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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
> 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?
YES
> 6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
YES
> 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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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, but I would prefer in the title the term "conversion" of... models instead of "import, export" of ...models
> 9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, only here and there some polishing needed, e.g. page 21 replace "to choice" by "to choose". Only a discretionary revision.

CONCLUSION:
Excellent article on an important topic (semantic interoperability and EHRs) I only have some concerns regarding the readability of the figures (screenshots), but
this might be OK...
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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