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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers

We appreciate your interest in our study. We are thankful for the useful comments from the reviewers. We have corrected the manuscript according to comments of the reviewers. Hope now the manuscript is clear and more informative. Once again we want to thank for your time and suggestions. Here are point by point responses to your comments.

Reviewer's report

Title: Factors Influencing Consumer Adoption of USB-based Personal Health Records in Taiwan

Version: 2 Date: 5 July 2012

Reviewer: Kuang-Yi Wen

Reviewer's report:

• Abstract needs to be more clear.

1. Background: Studies have proved Personal Health Records (PHR) could enhance clinical care efficiency and can also achieve the goal of patient-centered care…

this reviewer believes that PHR has been recognized with the potential to enhance clinical care efficiency and patient-centered care but very few or no study has really shown PHR’s effectiveness in improving these outcomes yet. Authors need to change this language.

Response: We have deleted this sentence. A new sentence is replaced from the
introduction section.
“Usually patients receive healthcare services from multiple hospitals, and consequently their healthcare data are dispersed over many facilities’ paper and electronic-based record systems.”

2. The key objective of this project – the key objective of the “parent” project? Response: We have added the word “core” project.
3. in the out-departments – outpatient department? Response: Corrected to outpatient department.
4. A total of 1549 responses were collected and out of these, 1465 were valid, accumulating the response rate to 48.83%.
1465/1595 is not = 48.83% Did you mean you distributed around 3000 surveys total? If we just read the abstract, it will not make sense.
Response: Yes. We agree. Thank for your correction. Now we have corrected the sentence to
“A total of 3000 questionnaires were distributed and 1549 responses were collected, out of those 1465 were valid, accumulating the response rate to 48.83%.”
Hope now it is clear.
5. Detailed analysis of the data reflected that there was a remarkable difference between the intent of the PHR adopters and non-adopter (#2 =182.4, p<0.001). Difference between adopters and non-adopter in terms of what?
Response: “usage intention” is added.
• English needs some editing and proofreading – I suggest the authors to have an editor to go through it. Some examples are below:
Response: The draft was proofread by a English speaker and English errors are corrected carefully all over the manuscript.
Abstract:
1. many countries have encouraged the(x) research on data interoperability, access, and patient's authorization.
Response: Sorry, I didn’t understood your comment.
2. This study is a(x) part of a national project to build an information exchange environment for cross-hospital
Response: I have added ‘an important’ part of a national project……
3. at the(x) ten medical centers
4. PHR adopters and non-adopter(s)
Response: corrected.
• The introduction section is improved.
• The results and discussion sections are improved.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.