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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the issues I had raised in the first review. However, I still do not have a clear sense of what "automatic provision of recommendation in electronic form as part of clinician workflow" meant in the studies and would suggest giving some more detailed examples in the Discussion on page 8. The authors might like to consider that they are giving a "how to" guide to the best examples in the literature. I think this would improve the useability of the review.
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