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Review 1:

Used suggestions:

* “critical discussion, comparison of the different approaches and conclusion are missing” 🡪 missing sections were not finished due to time problems and are added for the final version
* “the paper misses a critical section” 🡪 also extended with the additional chapter of discussion in the final version
* “there is no discussion and no conclusion chapter” 🡪 added for the final version
* “the state of the art seems to be described without criticism and comparison” 🡪 addresses the same thing like the previous point and is included in the final version

Discarded suggestions:

* “paper does not specify the problem around which the corresponding master thesis is centered” 🡪 paper has no corresponding master thesis, because it is for the course “seminar”
* “The introduction section does not contain the information for the importance of CPG” 🡪 in my opinion it does contain that they are necessary to improve the clinical and diagnostic processes. It also includes why the extraction of the knowledge contained in CPG it necessary 🡪 to put it in an format that is able to be auto-processed
* “the related work should contain more detail of the related work’s results” 🡪 that would blast the extent of the paper: in my opinion the related work section should only contain links to the actual related work and a small description 🡪 to get the whole information out of it, the related work literature has to be read
* “the number of references should be at least tripled” 🡪 for a master thesis this would be true, then it would be at least four or five times more, but in this case I think it is necessary to read enough literature to get the most needed information

Review 2:

This review does not really contain much information, since most of the review form sections are only answered by choosing a grade number out of the review forms offer.

It seems that the author “filled” this review form in less than 5 minutes.

Used suggestions:

* “references were omitted” 🡪 references included in the chapters
* “no critical discussion” 🡪 this section was missing as a result of problems with the time schedule and is added to the final version
* “Asgard/Asbru is used in the paper, but not included in the references” 🡪 references extended
* “the results of the evaluation should be more mentioned and discussed” 🡪 like already mentioned a few times, the discussion section was not finished, respectively written at all and will be included in the final version
* “Instead of I use We” 🡪 change executed for better soundness

Discarded suggestions:

* “no figures”: in my opinion there were no figures important enough to include it in the report