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Reviewer's report:

This paper is worthy of publication and only needs a few discretionary revisions in my opinion. It is well written, well referenced and definitely addresses an important topic.

I assume that the authors and editors have already noticed the minor problems such as that reference #2 is missing, etc.

I would suggest the authors consider the following:

- Is the term 'integrated' PHR necessary -- does it add anything to the term PHR or contribute to our international difficulty in using consistent terminology. If it is to be retained, an early definition of how the term 'integrated' is to be used would be helpful.

- In the Background, a few words about who the early adopters of the PHR are (e.g. mothers keeping children’s data or adults keeping their aging parent information) would be useful.

- Top of Page 4 – a reference to the Danish health portal would be informative

- 2nd paragraph of page 7 is an opinion which perhaps should come later in the paper

- Box 1 – is a 3rd column needed between ‘standalone’ and ‘integrated’ – perhaps ‘tethered’; makes one think of a spectrum of PHRs?

- Page 5 – bullet point on drug interaction assumes that a complete medications profile is available

- Page 6 – 2nd last paragraph – the chronic disease comments are important enough that they should be mentioned early in the paper; 1 or 2 references would help the reader

- Page 7 – Barriers to integrated PHRs – might be worth saying a few words about Denmark and Andalucia in Spain – both of whom have overcome some of the barriers

- Page 8 – done of commentary in ‘scope of work’ implies the patient has a physician – in a number of jurisdictions, patients are not able to find a physician
and have to depend on walk in clinics and emergency departments

- Page 8 – in physician compensation, would it be worth mentioning that Danish physicians are paid twice as much for e-mail with their patient as a phone call visit

- Page – Data Standards - it would help our international efforts if SNOMED CT was mentioned

- Page 9 – top paragraph – the success of the Scottish Emergency Care Summary is worth mentioning

- Page 9 – consumer confidence section – this is so important perhaps it should come after ‘health care system and culture”?

- Page 10 – top of page – add insurance companies would not have access

- Page 10 – High Enterprise Cost – worth mentioning the role of RHIOs and HIEs here?

- Page 10 – when RHIOs are mentioned, should the success at Indiana and others be mentioned?

- Page 12 – Sub title re: recent progress – add ‘in the US”?

- Page 13 – 2nd bullet – the accomplishments in Lombardia Italy would be worth referencing

- Page 13 – 3rd bullet – reference the English Healthspace and VA’s HealtheVet efforts?

- Page 14 – New Models section – suggest splitting out the ‘banks’ discussion into its own section; suggest adding reference to Protti paper on Bill Dodd’s Health Information Bank idea

- Page 16 – section on research and analysis – suggest this section be merged with material on research on previous page

Congratulations to the author’s for writing on this important subject.