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Reviewer's report:

The paper describes a study related to the changes in the use (completeness of the record) of Electronic Health Records when training and support is offered to doctors compared to the use of doctors where no training and support is offered.

**********Major Compulsory Revisions**********

Abstract

* A sample 20 families...—> English

Introduction

*(CAHHF), project team carried out a pilot study...—> English

* The objective at the end of the introduction is unclear: I would not use the term intervention. I would rather state what was actually done e.g. training. What is online data? I think this is ambiguous. Does this refer to the EHR data or ...?

-------- Remark: Please have the paper checked by a native speaker. Due to the number of mistakes I stopped to state them. --------

Methods

* Study population and sample: You state that 10 townships were selected based on their size and village doctors' background etc. Please state the exact parameters as well as their values. I am especially interested on the parameter village doctors' background as I think this is difficult to standardize. Which CHS were chosen? How were the CHS selected (attributes)? How were the families selected (attributes)? In simple words, change the paragraph so that your decisions can be traced and reproduced.

* Intervention: Who was exactly part of the intervention team? How can you be sure that there are no dependencies between the CHSS and/or doctors and the intervention team (e.g. experts from the county health bureau)?

* How was the raw data processed?

* What is also missing is a description of how you deal with influencing factors such as the availability and accessability of PCs or the age of doctors in the samples.

* State what kind of treatment (TCM or Western Medicine).
Results
* When you refer to a complete EHR record, what does this include? What is the content of the EHR? You should also state a definition for an EHR - maybe not in the results section but in the introduction - as it is unclear if you refer to the concept of an EHR or a certain EHR system.
* There is not much value in describing the changes in the content of the record when the total content of the EHR is not described. You also need to describe the training otherwise the effect of the training can’t be traced to a more complete record.
* Health management of the elderly: It is not enough to state that there was an increase in the completeness of records. This is of no value to the reader.
* In your tables you have the categories ‘No’, ‘Part’ and ‘Full’. These categories need to be defined.

Discussion
* In your paper you just state that there was an increase in completeness of records. What were the reasons for this? The training, maybe being observed, being reminded, ….. Although you provide some ideas in your discussion, has there been a formal analysis of the reasons?
* What would have been interesting: analyze the use after the training. Is the rate still high?

Conclusion
* You state that with little effort the situation could be improved. I doubt that, as from my experience the effect of such an intervention decreases right away after it is completed. I think one time training does not have a sustainable effect.
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