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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed the primary concerns about the manuscript. I believe this is an informative manuscript overall, but I do still have the sense that the manuscript could be further tightened to better convey the message and that some of the figures are not particularly information rich.

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.

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.

Beginning on line 516, the authors discuss ‘assistive tools’. Examples of specific tools that are not recorded as structured documentation might be useful here.

The authors now mention contexts outside of Sweden in several places; however, directly drawing out how their results inform other contexts might be helpful.

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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