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Reviewer's report:

Thanks the authors for taking on board my comments and provide corresponding answers satisfactorily. I am satisfied with the majority of answers. There are several issues I would like to seek further clarification from the authors.

Methods:

You may need to define the level of statistical significance in methodology section. Currently the message that p <10% is treated as statistically significant only comes at the results section. You may also need to justify why you choose 10% as the cutting point, not the conventional 5%.

The authors may need to present the information about the statistical packages used for data analysis in the methods section.

Possibly you should display p value in Table 2.

If you use both OLS and probit model to conduct multivariate analysis, you need to discuss which method is best to interpret your data in the discussion section. In consideration that all of the dependent variables were dichotomous variables, you may need to justify the suitability of OLS modeling.

Table 5 and Table 6. I am not sure what Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3 exactly are. I guess that they point to use as 1) ability to perform calculations, 2) ability to interpret results, and 3) ability to use results. These terms need to be explicit to improve readability of the paper.

Page 16. The paragraph on ‘Test-retest reliability and sensitivity’. The description of constructs should be in the same sequence as the order of presentation of the constructs in Table 2 to increase readability.

Page 19. Paragraph 3 tells the reader how RHIS tasks competence was measured. This information really should be placed in the methodology section, in page 11.

Appendix Table 1. There are two ‘use of information scale’ presented. I am confused which scale was used by the authors in further data analysis. I would like to read the authors’ comments on pros and cons of these two scales comparatively.
Figure 1 presents the hypothesized PRISM Evaluation Framework. Some of the relationships amongst the variables have been validated by the empirical results, some are not. I would recommend the authors to draw a final version of PRISM Framework that explicitly defines which relationships are validated and supported by the empirical evidence presented in this paper; which relationships are not.

Typos that should be changed in the text:
Page 5. para 1. Line 8 ‘carryout out’
Page 6 Line 8. lack of word between ‘responsible’ and ‘support’
Page 10. The second line from the bottom. ‘the total number items’ is not a conventional phrase.

I would be grateful if the authors could point to the specific section of the paper that the revision has been made to save me time searching for it.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.