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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Duftschmid and BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making editorial board,

Thank you for your review of our revised research article. We have responded to the minor revisions suggested by reviewer 5 below and have revised the manuscript accordingly. We have also submitted a completed change of authorship form to the editorial office to add Dr. Catherine Houlihan to the manuscript.

************
Fifth reviewer

1. “Every sentence in the methods section of the abstract starts with “we”. Consider changing this to improve readability. There is significant use of the word “we” throughout the paper…”

We have now updated the methods of the abstract to remove we from the 2nd sentence (which we have now split into two sentences) (abstract methods section, page 2, lines 36-38). We have also removed “we” through various parts of the paper where such a change did not lead to vaguer passive voice.

2. “You have labelled both panels as panel 1”.

Thank you for catching this typo. We have fixed this so that the second panel now says Panel 2 (top of page 8).

3. “I suggest reassessing the use of numbering throughout the document. For example, the sections on Implementing the medical records has a number of different level numbering within the text.”

This was also a typo that we have now corrected by deleting the superfluous “4)” (page 11, line 268) and “5)” (page 12, line 280) in the results section. We have checked numbering throughout the rest of the paper and have not found any other such errors.

**********

Thank you for the consideration of our manuscript and we look forward to any further feedback. Please let us know if there is any other information you need from us.

Yours sincerely,

Shefali Oza