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**Reviewer's report:**

The manuscript by Langton et al. analyzes the usage of eviQ among different levels of medical doctors in Australia. The authors present a laudable effort to delineate the frequency of the access to the eviQ. The study was interesting, but there are some reservations as to the interpretation of the data. Please refer to the following comments.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The authors have published a number of articles in relation to eviQ. Their data show eviQ is a useful system to guide health professionals for clinical practice. The aim of the current manuscript is to investigate how medical doctor in Australia use the eviQ. There are major problems in the methodology of samplings to accomplish this aim.

1. The title is not correct. Not all Australian medical doctors have registered this website. Therefore, the registrants cannot represent all Australian medical doctors. Perhaps the title should be changed as “how do registrants as medical doctors use……”.

2. The author used login system to determine the rate of usage. I am not sure whether this method can analyze how often medical doctors accessed the eviQ. A high rate of usage does not represent that many doctors use the eviQ. It may be modified by a few doctors who used the eviQ very frequently. It would be better if the authors could track how often the individual medical doctors accessed the eviQ through the login system.

3. The authors used an online questionnaire to achieve the above question: how often the medical doctors accessed the eviQ. This questionnaire survey is also a problem. The samplings of this questionnaire were not well randomized. For example, the medical doctors who often accessed the eviQ have more chance to see and filled this questionnaire. In contrast, doctors who less often accessed the eviQ have little chance to see and filled this questionnaire. Therefore, the respondents of the questionnaire survey cannot represent the whole group of eviQ users. So, the results of this questionnaire survey are not reliable. Perhaps the authors can ask the users through e-mail to minimize the bias.
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