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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your review, please find the authors’ responses in red.

Reviewer #1

1. Are you conducting a qualitative study or a quantitative one? You need to set forth the type of study. Depending on the type of study you choose, methods and means have to be justified accordingly. The evidence shown in this paper is insufficient.

Methodology section now is included as separate section

1. Abstract needs to be redone according to the changes requested in point 1 above.

Abstract is rewritten to reflect the changes

1. The issues cited as the requirements for the framework needs to be justified via statistics or other means.

Statistics now included in introduction section that highlight error ratios in the collected sample

1. A simple example workflow on the proposed framework would increase the clarity of the workflow as well as the quality of the paper.

An example was included at the end of discussion section to show the applicability of the model

Reviewer #2

1. Title

Title of the paper was changed to reflect the paper contents

1. Abstract

Abstract rewritten and reformatted

1. Keywords

Necessary keywords included now

1. Introduction
* The analysis of collected data including sample size and technique included now
* Statistics of error ratios in data included now for the collected sample and mentions for extreme error also provided “The analysis of the data herein pointed out many challenges, for instance, some reports have 35% incomplete data, other reports had more than 25 manual corrections, in addition to 5-7% of missing data and inconsistencies between working electronic laboratory systems and the corresponding manual aggregated data in the monthly reports for one health facility”
* New methodology section is included now
* The term health informatics was removed and rewritten
* New references included for the last 3 years
* Article was re-structured and additional sub section added and renamed
* Order of citation fixed
* The requirements for data preparation to enhance data quality for better decision making is more detailed now
1. Methodology

Methodology section is created and separated from model presentation section

1. Result

An example sub section was included at the end to illustrated the output of the model

1. Discussion

Example sub section added to discussion section

1. Model Implementation

Model implementation merged to discussion part

1. Citation

Citation revised according to journal guideline