Reviewer’s report

Title: An online evaluation about the effect of a personnel intervention pilot study for village doctors using electronic health records

Version: 2
Date: 11 February 2014

Reviewer: Barbara Castelnuovo

Reviewer’s report:

Electronic medical records are increasingly becoming important in resource constrained settings in improving medical health systems and increasing quality of care. Nevertheless, as the authors discuss, health care providers are frequently reluctant to use EMR, or the utilization is suboptimal.

In this article, the investigators explore the effect of a training and supervision intervention to enhance the use of EMR in a rural setting in China.

Major comments

General

The language should be revised. The authors should also revise the way information is provided in the different sections to improve the quality of the manuscript, see details below.

Methods

1) State clearly the study design at the beginning. It is not clear how the facilities were allocated/randomized to the intervention. Sampling: how the number 20 was chosen in regard of the families to be surveyed in each group?

2) The groups should be referred as “intervention” group (and not trial group) and control group, since both groups were included in the trial and analysis.

3) The section under “data collection” seems to be describing the study design and should be moved to the description of the study design, while the authors should give details on how the completeness of health medical records was assessed and by who, and what was used as a data collection tool. One of the main weaknesses of the manuscript is that it is not clear which are the main variables of interest and how were chosen (demographics, physical examination, vaccination, elderly). Maybe it would be useful to add at the beginning of the method section a paragraph describing EMR and what they are used for. The quality control section should be under data management and not standing by its own.

4) Ethics: were subject consented?

Results

Demographics. Majority of the information should be omitted by pointing out that there were no differences and referring to the table.

The remaining part of the results should be re-written to allow the reader to follow
without difficulties. This is also due to the fact that part of the methodology is not clear

Discussion.

It needs extensive re-writing. It seems to me from the results that despite statistically significant differences before and after the intervention, EMR are underutilized even after the intervention (e.g. health education, basic health information). Consequently I strongly disagree with the conclusion, as it seems this intervention is not enough effective.

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.
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