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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions-
This paper is a bit confusing and seems to be reliant upon another manuscript by the authors. The abstract is especially in need of revision for clear understanding.
- Do the authors consider their findings to be generalizable?
- On one hand, the authors say they are proposing testing in a primary care, but it is really more of a geriatric population? -What are the characteristics of providers?
- The relationship between the EHR and GEM should be more clearly explained. How do they work together?
- Was the GEM only used in the sample of patients or in all patients? It would seem that using it on all would really inform the providers about usability.
- If GEM was only used in the sample, did you use a control group of patients for measuring references? This would add validity to the study. Maybe those references are already used by some providers and GEM doesn't change anything.
- So (p 14) Practice B may not have even used GEM? But you're not sure? This is very weak unless I misunderstand in which case it should be made more clear.
- I'm not sure I see a lot of new contribution to the literature here.
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