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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study proposing principles and competencies for undergraduate education to guide the use of electronic patient records in the education of undergraduate healthcare students. I have a few suggestions for the authors to consider

Introduction: Please review the following sentences "This is will transform care". Could the authors describe the key objectives of this study at the end of the introduction.

Methods: How many experts were invited? How many agreed to be involved? There should be more description of the Delphi method in the methods section. What were the six principles? How did you decide on these? There should be some justification around the approach used. Right now I feel like some key details are missing.

Results: Right now the majority of results consists of a single table. There needs to be greater description of results, iterative processes involved in the study, changes made from throughout the process etc.

Discussion: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the study and what are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies. I am not sure a compelling argument around the value of EPRs in undergraduate education has been made. What are the translational effects of the findings from this study?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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