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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for revising your manuscript. You now define the intended meaning of reproducibility in the context of this work more clearly ("result replicability"). However, you remain sometimes vague on how your proposed technics can increase reproducibility of EHR research. In "normal" computer science result replicability is not a major problem. Given the data and the code, one would usually expects the same results. You mention some challenges (e.g. multidisciplinary teams, information governance restrictions, varying diagnostic granularity, …) throughout your manuscript that are specific to EHR research and impede reproducibility and a trivial rerun of the software. Try to be as specific as possible on why each of your recommendations is likely to overcome these challenges and increase reproducibility of EHR research.

References in your manuscript were not displayed correctly making it hard to review. Only "?" were visible instead of citations. Please try to fix these technical problems.

Suggestions:

p. 3 l. 33: Please include the protocol (http ?) in your URLs.

p.12, l 13 ff.: The short introduction of UML seems to be disconnected from the rest of the section about virtualization. The section about code development on p. 5 seems to be more fitting for UML.

Box 3: Git commands are probably meaningless to someone who does not know versioning. Maybe a flowchart-like picture of branches and merges can better illustrate your point ?
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