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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors resubmitted a moderately revised manuscript. In general, the review is difficult because a state-of-the-art document presenting the changes in detail is missing (e. g. using the track change mode of a text processing system).

The organization of the paper has improved by addressing the remarks of the previous review. Respective concerns are now cleared out. Furthermore, the authors explained in their answer that the current manuscript is thought as main publication of the DESDE-LTC instrument. Inconsistencies with material available on the Web are due to the preliminary kind of that material. The “gold standard” is presented in the manuscript. The authors carry on describing DESDE-LTC as ontology consistent.

The reviewer acknowledges the changes and comments of the authors. However, some concerns remain.

a) The abstract still misses the information that DESDE-LTC is significantly grounded on existing approaches. This should be added.

b) The reviewer was not able to understand, how the authors handle the result’s part related to the development of DESDE-LTC. The result’s section still starts with several paragraphs related to the instrument. Those paragraphs are not related to the evaluation. The authors wrote in their response that they relocated those parts to the method’s section. That should be done consequently.

c) The authors were not able to find the problem summarized with “Non mobile outpatient care is available in figure 1 but not present in the manual” in the first review. In fact, missing is “non mobile ACUTE outpatient care”. Why?

d) The meaning of “code” is still unclear:

- code=identifier or
- code=label or
- code=identifier+descriptor+label or
- something else?

Please make definitely clear what is meant by code. Then, use this definition consistently in the manuscript.
e) The authors should clarify why they need an identifier AND a label.

f) The authors point out that several concerns about the quality of DESDE-LTC are related to pragmatical decisions made by the project team in the development process. Therefore, the authors might claim that they established a system that is ready for use, but it still has weaknesses from a terminological point of view. Therefore, the reviewer suggests adding a constraint to the paper making these circumstances clear to the readers.
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