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MIDM-D-20-00148R2
Evaluation of standard and semantically-augmented distance metrics for neurology patients
Daniel B Hier, MD; Jonathan Kopel; Steven U Brint, MD; Donald C Wunsch II, PhD; Gayla R
Olbricht, PhD; Sima Azizi; Blaine Allen
BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Catherine Rice
BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Dear Ms. Rice:

Thank you for the careful review of our manuscript "Evaluation of standard and semantically-
augmented distance metrics for neurology patients" (MIDM-D-20-00148R2). We wish to thank
your reviewers in particular for their helpful suggestions that have made this a better submission.

Our responses are as follows:

Editor Comments:

1 - Please include a Keywords section to follow the Abstract. Three to ten keywords representing
the main content of the article should be included. COMPLETED.
2 - Please move the Abbreviations section to follow the conclusions, before the Declarations.
COMPLETED.

3 - Please move your Declarations to follow the Abbreviations. COMPLETED.

4 - At this stage, please upload your proofread manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethrough or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only. COMPLETED.

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer 1: I have no further comments. THANK YOU.

Reviewer 2: Authors did minor revisions with respect to the previous version, which have slightly improved it. Despite the results are negative, the paper is technically sound and the other reviewers consider the final result interesting for the community. On the other hand, semantic augmentation has been usually consider beneficial for document metrics and this work demonstrates that much more effort must be done to achieve good results with this technique. Finally authors show some future lines that could lead to better results. THANK YOU.

Reviewer 6: The authors have managed to answer all the concerns raised in the manuscript and proved experimentally the concerns raised. THANK YOU.

Again, thank you for your care and diligence during the review process.

Sincerely,

Daniel B Hier MD
Corresponding Author