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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting report.

Major Compulsory Revision: -

The paper concluded that '..we found that data for the preventive services we measured were not reliably entered over time in the medical records we audited when compared to provincial administrative data. Unreliable data cannot be used to measure and improve quality.'

I looked at the data, it seems to me that the greatest differences occurred in the first year after EMR was introduced, which could be explained by 'teething' problems in the introduction of a new information system and work processes in clinical practice. In fact Table 4 and Figure 1 suggested that there are signs of convergence of the levels of preventative services recorded by EMR and by Administrative data. The conclusion, particularly the statement 'data...were not reliably entered over time' seems rather strong.

Discretionary Revisions: -

This is more a request for clarification from the authors than a request for revision. The % of those with diabetes (at 8.2%) and mental health (at 21%) seem rather high. Perhaps this is a true reflection of the practice population under study.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Please see major compulsory revision

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
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8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
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