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Reviewer's report:

This is a longitudinal study of Finnish physicians' self-reported stress related to the use of electronic health records (EHRs). The same cohort of physicians was surveyed in 2006, 2010 and 2015, and included physicians in primary care and non-primary care specialties. The primary finding is that stress related to EHRs progressively increased in each year surveyed. Time pressure, non-primary care specialty and on-call duties were associated with higher levels of EHR-associated stress. Contrary to a common stereotype (at least in the US) age was not associated with experiencing higher levels of EHR-stress.

The strengths of this study include the size and stability of the study cohort and the high response rate. The weaknesses of the manuscript are primarily in the writing.

The manuscript would benefit from editing by a native English speaker, as there are many awkwardly phrased sentences and places where the authors' intended meaning is not clear.

In addition, I recommend that the focus of the paper be tighter. The introduction could be shortened considerably. The section on the Finnish context however was quite helpful and should be retained to help the international audience.

I suggest that the authors present only their most meaningful data points and associations, rather than what appeared to be all data points, including those for which there was no clear interpretation. For example, the report of the lack of gender differences in the first two waves along with a finding of a gender difference in the third wave feels like distraction rather than meaningful data. This same information was repeated without interpretation or significant added discussion in the Discussion section.

The authors would be wise not to overreach in their conclusions. For example, the statement on p 16, line 17 does not appear to be supported by the data.
In the conclusion the authors introduce new concepts, such as in lines 40-52. It is best not to introduce new ideas in the conclusion.

The data may not allow this level of inquiry, but if it does, it would be interesting to explore whether high levels of SRIS in 2006 predict career changes (i.e. from clinical practice to leadership roles, or from public to private practice, or away from on-call responsibilities) in subsequent years.

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.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

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.
I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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