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Reviewer's report:

• Overall the paper is well written and the methods are generally appropriate. Adoption and acceptance of health information technology are important topics.

• Other studies have modified TAM and tested it with various technologies in healthcare (authors should refer to the review in Holden and Karsh, 2010, J Biomed Inform, 43(1)) including telemedicine. Authors should discuss what they believe to be the unique contribution of this paper.

• More should be said on the source, development, testing, and validation of the survey items.

• Using the Technology Acceptance Model to study adoption (as opposed to post-adoption acceptance/use) of a technology is questionable. At the time of the survey, was the telemedicine technology hypothetical or did respondents know enough about it to form valid perceptions of ease of use, usefulness, etc?

• When discussing dichotomizing BI: what is “5.0” (the response scale goes from -3 to 3)? More should be said: how was BI originally distributed? How many of each response were in each bin of the dichotomized variable? This dichotomization should also be considered as the authors discuss and interpret results: the models are predicting a step from “low to moderate” to “high” intention.

• The decision to compute a second logistic regression model with disaggregated scale items needs to be explained. The logic for aggregating in the first place competes with the logic for a disaggregated analysis, which is why usually one or the other is done.