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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written manuscript that clearly outlines what you have done in an extreme situation.

I have significant concerns about the actual structure of the manuscript and fit within the headings. I suggest that you write the method and results in a 3 stage approach. Stage 1 - determining input/outputs, stage 2 - implementing, and stage 3 - evaluation.

The section from line 209 on page 9 to line 363 on page 15 is really results not method and this should be moved to the start of the results section.

Once these changes are undertaken the abstract will need to be reworked to reflect the changes. In particular the methods section of the abstract is very weak and does not adequately describe the actual method using any methodological terms. There are so many questions raised when reading this section of the abstract for example: how did you develop the key questions? Was there any validation process? What was the selection process for determining your 'relevant personnel'? Did you use interviews or focus groups or survey?

In the results section of the abstract you do not actually describe any results except usage, which is not what the method section describes.

Minor issues:

P3 line 67-68 this sentence need a reference or expansion on how EMRs make patient care more efficient and accurate.
P4 line 76 in the final sentence you state clinical trials cannot be started without high quality medical records - this needs justification as we know clinical trials have been occurring for a long period of time without such records.

Again on P8 line 183 onwards - you need to explain the actual methods used and preferably discuss the methodology.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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:
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