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General

The authors created a survey on the impact of an EHR on learning. They surveyed third-year medical students and obtained 33/53 completed questionnaires. Survey results are given.

Other notes: Single site, single system, small sample size.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes, appears new.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   The sample size is small. Response rate was 62%.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   The manuscript (Table 1) should show more information than the aggregate of Strongly Agree, Agree. Would be interesting to see negative effects of HER. For example, 69% responded to either neutral, disagree, strongly disagree to the last question. Was it mostly neutral or strongly disagree?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, limitations addressed

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes, it is clearly written.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. As mentioned in question 4 above, putting in more details on the results of the survey would be useful.

2. Although there is limited information on ambulatory medical student experiences with EHRs, it would make sense to incorporate the recent review article on EMRs and impact on resident and medical student education – Acad Psych nov-Dec 2006. Of note, the manuscript could include info on previous research conducted on inpatients. While this review was not published until after this study, some of the primary studies may have helped with questionnaire generation.

3. The method of implementation is likely key for some of the decision support. How was this done?
   Was accessing guidelines usable – (for a patient with heart failure, here are the recent AHA guidelines or was it a IE link to guideline clearinghouse of all thousands of guidelines.)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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