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General

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. Raw numbers along with percentages including one decimal place should be consistently reported throughout the abstract, text and tables in the manuscript; use consistent rounding--sometimes decimal places have been dropped, and sometimes units are rounded up.
2. Statistical testing for significant differences between participants and non-participants should be added to table 1--show actual p value.
3. Some argue that larger physician practices are more likely to participate in registries, does this data confirm/refute that assertion?
4. The abstract reports that chi-square tests for association were performed, but none of those results are discussed.
5. In the abstract conclusion, would it be more accurate to state that a majority of participating providers are not utilizing some of the value-added aspects of registries and more study is required to ascertain why they are not?
6. What do these findings say about the likelihood of reaching the 2010 registry objectives?
7. Explain why "non participants" = designated non participant from state list AND self-identified as non participant. Why not simply use self-identification as the "gold standard"?
8. Copies of the surveys or a list of survey questions should be included in an appendix.
9. Were practices asked about their payer mix? (e.g., proportion Medicaid)Is that correlated with registry use?
10. In table 2, clarify that respondents could provide more than one response and include raw numbers.
11. Can you correlate the time spent in registry related tasks to the number of children or providers in the practice?
12. On pg. 7, the % for interaction with registry total more than 100%.
13. The implications of the correlation results reported at the top of pg. 8 as well as the participant feedback should be discussed in more depth.
14. The opening paragraph of the discussion should summarize the main findings.
15. I question the assertion on pg. 8 that a 62% overall accuracy in classification is high enough to be useful.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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