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Reviewer's report:

Authors of this paper developed an BPM-based approach to optimize clinical pathway management in hospital. The idea is interesting. However, there are some deficiencies as well. In my opinion, this manuscript can be published after revision.

First and most importantly, authors mentioned the difficulties to manage clinical pathway. They claimed they adopted BPM to optimize the performance and obtained a good result in next section while they got the conclusion just by statistics. It will be helpful to make the illustration more clearly if authors can show readers a specific example to illustrate the advantages of BPM compared to the current method.

Second, in the Section "Process definition and Architecture", authors emphasized the necessity of having a flexible process was the main reason for adopting the innovative architecture. Actually, readers may not understand what the "architecture" is because it seems that BPM cannot deal with the case that clinical pathway itself were modified. More explanations would be appreciated.

Third, in the Section "our case", authors used too many words to introduce their hospital. I suggest the authors rewrite it in a brief and concise manner.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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