

Reviewers' comments to authors on the paper

***SNOMED CT's RF2: Is the Future Bright?***

Ceusters W.

**Reviewer 0:**

No comments

**Reviewer 1:**

In order, the paper being intelligible on its own, insert some explanations for the issues concerning SNOMED underpinnings: (1) Mixing of object and meta-language and use-mention confusions, (2) Unclear about what some conceptIDs exactly refer to (unclear referencing of real-world entities), (3) Unclear use of the reasons for inactivation (uninformative reasons for change).

An appropriate location for the explanations is just before the last paragraph of first section.

→ We gave the explanations, but rather in the discussion.

Include a readme file (in the zip with additional data - CeustersMIE2011AddData.zip) for explaining rows and columns for each spreadsheet.

→ That is a good suggestion.

**Reviewer 2:**

The paper is well articulated, nicely presented and referred. It shows the broad understanding of the domain. My only comment is that this combines a research and also a well reasoned set of suggestions of improvement of a widely used system in health informatics. The slightly different focus of the two topics might have been better expressed by writing two joint papers, first dealing with the research, showing the findings, and a second one that details the suggested improvements.

→ Details about the suggested improvements will indeed be the topic of a second paper.