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Reviewer’s report:

General

I enjoyed this paper. It is an important topic, with too little well-conducted research. The authors have devoted more care and attention to the topic than any other paper I am aware of. (I should make clear that I am not an expert in evaluation techniques.) The graphical representation of the results such as in Figures 1 and 2 is clear and helpful.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I prefer the active rather than the passive voice, throughout the paper. E.g. "In this paper we present a new questionnaire instrument" instread of the first sentence of the second paragraph on page 4.

Is the questionnaire intended to measure satisfaction? If not, why not? It would be worth making this explicit.

Define electronic medical record, and the functions or tasks this questionnaire is intended to study. Results review? Note entry? Order entry?

How valid was time estimation?

Result section could be shortened.

Does this questionnaire allow comparison one vendor's software with another? This is not clear in my reading. The instrument may be used for measurement across vendor systems. Please address this question in the discussion.

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

Page 3 correct 'thatthe'
Page 10 correct "maximallyless"

There are several other minor typographical errors that may have been created in converting this document into pdf format.

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

None
Advice on publication: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: A paper of considerable merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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