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Reviewer's report:

It is an interesting manuscript however there are some structural mistakes and missing parts that need to be addressed before publication.

The second comment of the second reviewer regarding more explanation about the method is not sufficiently answered by the authors. In the method section, it is not clear how the test and train sets were selected. Moreover, the difference between the dataset and the standard are not clear in the manuscript e.g. in the following sentence 'Our datasets thus use three different annotation standards: i2b2-2014, i2b2-2006, and Mimic-III'.

Some of the explanation in pages 5 (line 50 afterward) and 6 are related to the method section.

The third comment of the second reviewer is also not addressed sufficiently. Some of the explanation in the results section are actually the applied method e.g. information presented in page 15.

The structure of the discussion section is not follow a scientific writing of a discussion. Readers can not find information regarding the comparing the results of the other similar study with the results of this study. Moreover, what are the strength and weakness points of the current study? What are the implications of this study? What are the possible future work?

Nearly all sentences in the conclusion started with the word "organizations" which seems odd for the readers.

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

No

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.

No
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.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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