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Reviewer’s report:

Statistical analyses:

1. It would be helpful if the authors could specify more clearly how zero-truncated Poisson model was used to address which specific questions. I assumed it was used to compare the information quantity only, and the results presented in Table 2 were results from the zero-truncated Poisson model analysis? Please clarify.

2. Also regarding Table 2, it was unclear what variables were included in the models. Based on the description in the statistical analysis section, seemed like separate models were run for each type. However, if models were run for >65 (Paper vs. Electronic), how was the age variable being treated? Presumably it was excluded? But from the presentation of Table 2 it was not clear.

3. Considering that there was an analysis performed with “types for all age” and an age control variable was included in the model, why not use an interaction term to examine how the use of electronic vs. paper differ by age group <65 vs >65 rather than running separate regression models.

4. Comments 2-3 apply to the log binomial model.

5. Was the table for the results for the analysis regarding imprecision included somewhere in the paper?

6. The authors mentioned that “A stepwise variables selection procedure was performed in order to determine the final model.” Was the “final model” referring to the one presented in the tables? What other variables were considered but dropped in the selection process?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests