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Reviewer's report:

The paper has been improved significantly. The concerns raised by the reviewers have been addressed adequately. Nevertheless, I have one suggestion:

Section 2.5 (dataset and validation of the method) should be merged with section 3.2 (validating of the system) and the text devoted to the interpretation of the results (page 18, line 19-page 19, line 3) in order to deal with the complete evaluation (evaluation scenario, validation results and validation results explanation) in a single section.

And several minor concerns:

Page 6, line 23: "have different degree of speech impairment of speech". Revise the text.

Page 7, line 11: "we propose we propose a novel". Revise the text.

Page 7, line 14: data to record --> data to be recorded

Page 7, line 21: "covered by the SARA?", the question mark should be removed.

Page 7, line 23: "rating scale?", the question mark should be removed.

Page 7, line 28: step 3, please explain briefly the scope of the two developed clinical archetypes

Page 8, line 28: "In total, 12 HPO classes were annotated (supplementary material), which provided the set of seed terms required to extracting". Were the HPO classes actually annotated or were selected?.

Page 11, line 17, the Figure number is missing (Figure 9?)

Page 12, line 3, The Figure number is missing (Figure 9?)

Page 13, line 17, Fig. 9 --> Fig 10?. It seems that for figure numbers greater or equal to 9 the figure number is wrong
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