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Reviewer's report:

The authors address an important topic of education in the use of electronic patient records which is relevant to the audience of this journal. The authors present results from a National Working Group to integrate electronic patient records (EPRs) into undergraduate education for healthcare students.

The abstract contains essential details. The introduction builds a case for identifying competencies guiding the integration of EPRs into undergraduate healthcare programs. A Delphi process which was used to identify the principles and competencies is described. The results of the Delphi process are clearly presented in Table 1. The discussion section explores how the identified competencies relate to existing literature.

Some suggestions for clarification and improvement are below:

* A description of the method by which disagreements were resolved and consensus was reached should be included.

* More should be included in the discussion about how the principles may relate to each other, particularly areas of potential overlap for example: "communication and multi-disciplinary working"; "generating data and monitoring and audit".

* The term EPR should be spelt out in the abstract the first time it is used in the abstract.

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

Yes

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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Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my
report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal