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Reviewer's report:

I am happy that my concerns have been addressed but did not understand the statement on page 8 'We did not create a central review protocol and followed PRISMA guidelines except for meta-analyses.' Perhaps this could be clarified?

Similarly, I think the end of the following sentence (page 12) needs rephrasing to be clearer: 'For purposes of analysis, we extracted data from 101 articles and articles containing the same intervention were only included once in the analysis 3 articles [25-27] and 2 articles [28, 29].'

There are four instances where a sentence starts with 'And', but this is an editorial issue - no change required if the editors are happy.

The review was conducted in North America where despite the availability of the technology, use of electronic health records is some way behind that of Europe. This makes the final statement of the conclusion sound dated, it is a conclusion that could have been safely drawn at any time over the past 20 years. A conclusion resulting more clearly from the analysis could be used here, otherwise the Conclusion sounds weak from a European perspective. For example, the statement at the end of the Abstract ‘Asthma guidelines generally improve patient care and practitioner performance regardless of the implementation method.’ would I think be much better.

These suggestions are discretionary. This is a useful and comprehensive review that will contribute significantly to the literature.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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