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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your attention and thoughtful responses to the points raised in review. I think that the paper is improved as a result of the revisions, and in particular that the discussion is now more substantive and adds a critical depth to the project through extending beyond describing the content of the reviewed papers. The addition of the section on trust is effective. In my view this will be a useful addition to the literature, particularly for readers seeking an introduction to ethical considerations relating to patient access to notes.

There are some outstanding minor issues of phrasing which should be addressed before this paper is ready for publication. I have annotated the manuscript for grammatical issues/phrasing/specific points. These are more readily conveyed in comments on the manuscript than here, because navigating feedback line by line easier in document. I can see that many of the points I raised in first review have not been altered here: perhaps the authors did not have access to the pdf I attached.

The abstract appears unrevised- please see my annotated version of the manuscript- 'tenant' is the wrong word' you mean 'tenet'. I suggest removing the phrase 'the supremacy of' in the first sentence. The impression that you employ a critical method is still given here. The abstract should be sharpened and updated and a stronger rationale for the review provided.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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