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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The paper needs a clearer focus.

2. The methodology used to develop the article would be helpful. The context of the work is not clear. The role of the AHIC in the conduct of the work and or its description in the manuscript in addition to the brief sentence in the acknowledgements should be included in the beginning of the paper.

3. There are a number of terms and acronyms used throughout the document and it is not clear if and when the terms are intended as synonyms. To the extent that the terms have different meanings and/or applicability the authors should be clear. These terms include: personalized health care and personalized medicine; “HIT platforms”; CDS tools; EHRs; HIT. At a minimum the terms as sued by the authors need to be defined.

4. The goals of the paper are not clear. For example, on page two in the abstract the authors note “we consider the current and desired state of decision support for personalized medicine…..” On page 4 the authors state “the paper outlines the current state of the art in information management…..”

5. It is not clear if the authors are referring to information management, HIT, EHRs, and/or clinical decision support tools.

6. It is not clear if the example of the human genome project (page 2) is the only relevant example of “personalized health care”.

7. The paper would benefit from a working definition of personalized health/medicine as used by the authors.

8. Page3- It is not clear how evidence based clinical guidelines relate to the prior emphasis on EHRs and CDS

9. Beginning on page 7- are these example hypothetical or real? The document should be clear. The ramification/implication of the examples is not clear.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 11- “as demonstrated above, CDS tools “can” enable—would “have the
potential to” be a more accurate statement

2. Page 20 first sentence under paragraph “Organizations that develop….“ Is not clear…..

3. Stakeholders roles section –this section does not allow for a depiction of the possible collaboration that should be conducted across stakeholders. Think it would be useful to consider grouping and presenting the recommendations by topic and not by stakeholder.

4. The conclusion is somewhat weak and potentially confusing. The benefits of the specific recommendations proposed would be especially useful.

5. The flowchart/graphic that follows the chart is not clearly explained.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. Authors should review the use of verb tense throughout the document. It appears inconsistent.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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