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Reviewer's report:

The major problem with current manuscript is that discussion on policymaking is prevalent rather than concentration on actual study and results. Unfortunately 16% response rate represent significant non-respondent bias toward better acceptance of electronic technologies even demographic characteristic respondents and non-respondents the same. This even become more problematic when almost 60% non-EMR users were excluded from analysis. The cohort that finally was analyzed represent strict category (7%) of all family physicians and cannot be used for generalizability (and policymaking).

Title of study “Improving performance in primary care through the meaningful use of electronic medical records: Test of an integrated structural model” and abstract not reflect problem above and not reflect aim and methodology.

Background and conclusion sections contains opinions rather than focus on aim, methodology and results.

Other comments
Page 5 Lines 3-8. No needs outline how paper organized
Page 19. Lines 14-16 has strong wording like “this study has produced results that should be valid, useful, and generalizable to other types of CIS.” that should be avoided as well as in abstract
Pages 20-21: are discussion rather then conclusions.
Pages 20-21: No comparison with similar studies discussed
Page 21; no limitation section/ not reflect all limitations of study

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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