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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This paper is reporting on a study that strives to find a common workflow with less branching that can enables documentation of the care processes (for the purpose of research, quality assurance, and cancer registry) with less effort. It is a really important paper, reporting on a valuable development. I think the methodology section of the paper caries the most. There are, however, some issues mainly with the way of writing and reporting that I think will improve the quality of the work if they are considered in revising the manuscript.

1. Introduction is too long and can safely be shorten by moving the context of the study into the Methods section.

2. In the Methods section: no detailed information about the interview such as how many interviews have been performed. Why other role players in the workflow processes (for example nurses) were not interviewed? I would suggest the presented steps, e.g., steps 4 and 5, separated and defined clearly.

3. In the result section line 207: what is similarity/conformity coefficient? The definition of the coefficient and the way it has to be interpreted were not presented in the methods section.

Line 222: … “The potential combinations were previously analysed according to the UICC- and AJCC-system and follow up intervals and procedures were collected for all entities and arranged in tables.”

A) Although presented in abbreviation list at the end of the manuscript, for the sac of readability, abbreviations should be defined at first place they appear in the text.

B) If this was part of the methodology, there should be a counter part for it at the result section. At least an example should be presented to show how the combinations were performed.

4. Answers to the research questions should typically be provided (clearly) at the first part of the Discussion section of the paper.

5. In the reference section: the Vancouver style was not followed carefully in
many references. See for example: reference 9. Considerable part of the literature is not in English. As a result their meaning, relevancy, and etc. is not understandable for an international audience.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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