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Reviewer's report:

In principle, analysing patients' adoption on PHRs through a questionnaires is of prime importance. However, the questions should be more specific in the sense that the USB-PHR system could be improved based on the responses. For now, the questions are too general - measuring only whether the patients were more or less satisfied. As a result the conclusions of the research were overly general and easily predictable without a specific statistical analysis.

There are also other weaknesses in the paper. The distinction between PHRs and EHRs should be clearly specified: EHRs are the data sources of PHRs. Also some kind of classification of various types of PHRs would be useful. For example comparing Internet-based PHRs and UBS-based PHRs.

An interesting focus of the research would be the searching and retrieval methods supported by the USB-PHR. The authors only state that the content of the PHR is based on HL7 CDA-R2. An interesting point would be to analyse the dependencies between the data retrieval methods and the CDA Levels supported the PHR, i.e., whether the PHR is based on CDA Level 1, 2 or 3.

I suppose that the PHR is based on the CDA CDD but the authors do not give any information about the used template. Used template is important because the data sources of the PHRs have to be compliant with data sources; otherwise transforming the data orginted from EHRs may be problematic.

The presentation could also be improved in many ways including English, structuring, and the introduction of the topic and used research methods.
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Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.