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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a well thought out and detailed description of their excellent work to build a comprehensive HIS during the 2014-2015 Ebola outbreak. I feel the piece can be improved by briefly addressing the following questions.

1. While there is excellent discussion comparing a full HIS to paper records, it would be helpful to understand why a full EHR like OpenMRS was chosen versus other approaches, such as simple ODK forms or simple apps, was selected. This is especially relevant given the success of rapid data collection during the most recent ebola outbreak in DRC where health data kit and similar apps were shown to be quite effective. Consideration of the latest data would improve the timeliness and relevance of the piece.

2. The piece would benefit from the discussion of user workflow. Was the exact same workflow used for the PMR and the EHR? Where exactly was double entry required etc.? Were both the PMR and EHR used in the red and green zones? Maybe a simple workflow diagram would help?

3. It appears that the methodological discussion could be much shorter as many described aspects are well-known characteristics and methodologies of agile software development, which the authors mention later. I view this as optional and just mention for consideration as it may improve the article flow and readability.
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