

29841-ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Reviewer #1 Comments

The authors investigated scoring systems of evidence for clinical application. The aim was clear and results were useful. Not many readers may be familiar with modified Delphi methodology. It was hard to obtain the whole picture of the study. It would be helpful to add introduction of Delphi methodology in Introduction. It was not clear how the authors performed the present study. Figures would present the procedures of scoring more clearly and easily to understand.

Reviewer #2 Comments

The paper is of interest and well written.

Author Response

We appreciate the reviewers' comments. Based on the recommendation of reviewer #1, an introduction to the Delphi methodology and a figure describing the study's methodology were added to the manuscript. Changes have been highlighted yellow in the attached revised manuscript.

Journal Editor-in-Chief's Comments

This reviewer would agree with the other reviewers on their decisions. The authors have properly addressed the comments from the reviewers, although there still exist needs for further improvement as listed below. 1) To better reflect the paper contents, the title of this report can be slightly modified as "Towards automated calculation of evidence-based clinical scores", because their work appeared to be an ongoing effort. 2) Please correct a few typo-errors such as in Core tip on page 5: importance instead of important; and in Applications on page 12 (bottom): automate instead of automated. 3) In Innovations and breakthroughs on page 12: it is better modified as "This study is a comprehensive assessment of importance of automating calculation of clinical scores in the inpatient setting." , to be more objective.

Author Response

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript. I have reviewed the editor-in-chief's recommendations and have made the respective changes to the attached manuscript.