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Reviewer’s report:

i) Even after all the revisions made I regard this paper as not fit for publication, and it seems that the quality and detail the data (can) provide do not allow any further improvement - so I suggest to reject the paper for good.

ii) Some details:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   It seems ok, but rather limited: "to provide an insight in the state of development of basic ICT infrastructures and applications in primary care systems of 31 countries in Europe and to describe for which purposes General Practitioners (GPs) use the computer in their practice." It focuses on description only, and does not even include a critical review and juxtaposition with other more detailed results in the literature they cite, particularly also [30]

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No, it is not sufficient. See 3.
3. Are the data sound?
   Probably not:
   - there does not exist a clear definition of the concepts on which the questions are based, and how they were operationalised.
   - the detailed questions used are not mentioned
   - Sampling is totally unclear:
     a) What was the universe, how was it structured with respect to the data reported for the sample (gender, age, location, ...)
     b) How was it drawn? (simple; structured by certain criteria, ...)
     c) How representative is it of the universe?
     d) In Table 1 "unweighted numer" is mentioned - how where the data later weighted to be (more) representative?
     e) How did you proceed with interviewing - e.g. how often did you remind the GPs to respond? How did you proceed in case (too) many did not respond at all? What was the respond rate by country? What explains the considerable difference in sample size, and what impact might this have had on the results? Comparing your data in Table 2 with those in [30] it seems your samples are biased towards GPs using a computer responding mostly, rather than those not using a computer (in several countries).
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?  
Yes, but: Printed in black & white, Figure 1 is not legible; Figures 2 ff do not convey sufficient detail and insights to justify covering so many pages.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?  
No, see 3.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?  
No, merely descriptions, and considerable parts discuss general eHealth policies, but do not relate the descriptive results to any details of the respective health system (Bismarck, Beveridge, mostly private, mixed, ...), the reimbursement situation, national regulations, structural differences, national eGovernment or general IT infrastructure, ...

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?  
Only partially

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?  
Partly, they do not reflect sufficiently on what they describe and how it relates to the results of others, what might explain the considerable differences in the results, ...

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?  
Ok

10. Is the writing acceptable?  
Not at all - already page one is full of mistakes "55: , the healthcare workforce is expected to be widely and deeply changed  
62. drivers of grown;  
73: There are evidences  
81: physicians salaried by capitated or budgeted organizations "

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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