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Reviewer’s report:

This paper was submitted as a paper software. The manuscript shows a platform named TASKA which has been developed within the context of an European project (EMIF). The aim of the platform is to provide a task/workflow management systems, mainly focused on settings related with clinical settings. The authors mentioned that the main differences between their approach and other existing ones such as Galaxy or Taverna is mainly based on the scope of the software.

The paper is well written and the software presented is more than a prototype, being fully available online. This is something very interesting because not always is easy to find a real implementation of some works in this context. Also the authors are providing access to the source code, which gives even more value to it.

In terms of technical aspects, I don't have any deep comment. The authors mentioned HTML5 and RESTful as some technologies, but I imagine that some others might be used. If this is the case, I suggest to provide them within the manuscript.

The figures provided are ok, but they have a low resolution. Maybe is because of PDF generation. Please check and try to provide figures with a higher quality.

Finally, my only questions is about precisely the use of well-known vocabularies in the setting of the project. What kind of coding terminologies are specifically supported by TASKA? Maybe a table provided this information might be useful. On the other hand, have the authors perform any usability test? If so, probably it is interesting to provide also some details.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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