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Accessing and sharing health information for post-discharge stroke care through a National Health Information Exchange platform- a case study

Nadia Davoody, PhD; Sabine Koch, Professor; Ingvar Krakau, PhD; Maria Hägglund, PhD BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Dear Editor-in-Chief

Thank you for considering our paper for publication in your journal! In this cover letter we have addressed the changes point-by-point.

Best regards

The authors

Reviewer 1:

1. The authors may consider using consistent wording for describing the study aim in the abstract and in line 128-129. Change has been done in lines 28-31.
2. Line 340-341 "(1) a patient case based on the previous personas, (2) a mapping of the journey model with the patients' needs" are actually both presented in 3.1. I suggest to merge (2) into (1), so that the opening paragraph of the Result section has 3 sentences corresponding to the subsections 3.1-3.3. Change has been done in lines 319-321.

3. The authors need to double check the numbering of tables. In line 800, shouldn't this Table 3 be Table 1? Otherwise there is no Table 1 in the manuscript. That’s right. The table in line 858 (previous 800) is table 1.

4. In response to Reviewer 1 comment 9, the authors responded that the "information about me" is added in the Table 1. But there is no Table 1 and this information is actually found in Table 2. That’s right. You can find “information about me” in table 2.

5. Line 599, instead of "service contact", do you mean "service contract"? Change has been done in line 580.

6. Please use the reference style recommended by BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. You can refer to the latest publication. The whole reference list is now changed based on the style recommended by BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. Change has been done in lines 602-850.

Reviewer 2:

1. In the abstract, the results, which focus primarily on which information is available, does not match the conclusion, which focuses on whether patients can share information with providers. This pattern occurs to some degree in the manuscript as well. The discussion focuses on the lack of bidirectional communication, when the study as a whole covers much more ground. Changes have been done in lines 42 and lines 533-535.

2. Some writing remains confusing, such as verb tenses on 153-154, where it is not clear if 2 million persons used Journalen in May 2018 or had used it by May 2018. Changes have been done in lines 147-148.

3. Beginning on line 516, the authors discuss 'assistive tools'. Examples of specific tools that are not recorded as structured documentation might be useful here. Change has been done in line 493.

4. The authors now mention contexts outside of Sweden in several places; however, directly drawing out how their results inform other contexts might be helpful. Changes have been done in lines 522-527.