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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors conclude that the eCDS was foremost not valued because it was not considered useful. They distinguish between physicians that seemed to report the system as more useful than other propofessionals. However, the term perceived usefulness seems to imply that there is a good match between the system and the professions targeted. The comments suggest that there was a mismatch between the system and the professions targeted. The article would be stronger if the data were analyzed in terms of perceived mismatching of the data and other perceived usefulness.

2. It would be helpful for the authors to discuss more fully what aspects of this evaluation were unique to this implementation. For instance, the physicians noted in their comments that the system contained too much text. This is a problem that is more easily addressed than issues with integration into workflow. These factors could play into the perceived usefulness.

Minor Revisions

1. Page 5. The author mentions that physicians could see all reminders under the names of patients. Is there data on how often this was used and if it was used did the pop-up reminders cease?
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