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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript has been improved. However, in order to be published in the BMC Health Services Research, I suggest the followings:

• Title would be much more relevant and direct as “factors influencing consumer adoption of USB-based personal health records in Taiwan”.

• EMR, EHR or PHR have different definitions. If the authors don’t distinguish them, I suggest the authors to only elaborate on PHRs directly, including its importance, potential values, etc to support the rationale for the study. Otherwise, currently in the introduction, EHRs was first introduced, then PHRs but the text flow does not show a good connection and relationship between them.

• At the end of introduction, authors claim that “the results of this study might help the designers in designing effective PHRs…” which is an overstatement given that this study did not examine which PHRs components are more effective than the others.

• In the research model, the term causal relationship was used in referencing to figure 1. However, causal relationship model is usually examined by path analysis or SEM, which is not the case in this study.

• Under measures and data analysis section, measure-related information should be discussed first, then data analysis information. For example, Likert scale description can be moved up.

• The last paragraph above the results section addressing the written consent and the IRB should be moved to the participant enrollment section. There is no need to mention IRB approval number and IRB chairman in the manuscript.

• In the results section, the paragraph above table 2 addressing chi-square tests examining differences between adopters and non-adopters needs to be mentioned in the data analysis section. Here, just need to report the results directly, don’t need to explain the rationale for the analysis. Also, variables of experiences of releasing paper-based medical records and hospitalization or referral were not mentioned in the measure and data analysis section. Is “Usage intention” the same variable as “Intention of Use”? If so, please stick with one term throughout.

• In multivariate logistic regression (Table 5), should be Table 3.

• “the adjusted odds ratio showed patients who had age above 60 years were more prone to adopt PHR”…actually you need to state which group you compare with. Also 40-49 years old group was also more likely to adopt PHR compared
with those who are under 29 years old, which was presented in the table but not in the results text here.

- The paragraph describing table 3 really need to be rephrased with more clarity. For example, “those with higher educational level were more less likely to adopt PHR”, or “participants reporting higher usage intention were more likely…”. The last sentence does not work, either.

- The five main variables (perceived usefulness, ease of use, subjective norm, privacy and safety, and computer self-efficacy) were scored on 1-5 scale but were used as binary variables in table 3. Need explanation how you reconstructed these variables for logistic regression analysis.

- This reviewer wonders why only usage intention variable was included in table 2 but not the other variables, and why the two “experience” variables were in table 2 but not in table 3.

- The title for table 3 might be better as "multivariate logistic regression of predictors of PHR adoption".

In sum, I think the manuscript findings is publishable but I sincerely suggest the authors to carefully go through and revise the manuscript to make it very clear. For example, when reporting logistic regression results, you need to indicate the reference group.

**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.