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Author’s response to reviews:

Respected editor and reviewer, i tried to incorporate all comments in point by point response in the document as follows.

Point by point response for the reviewer comments

Comment 1: There are still phrasing and grammatical errors throughout, albeit improved. This needs more thorough review and updates prior to publication for correct syntax and readability.
Answer: Thank you for the comment. We tried to correct the phrasing and grammar issues. We have made a substantial modification the manuscript.

Comment 2: The references remain incomplete and inconsistently formatted (e.g., journal/source names are missing).
Answer: Thank you very much for your constructive comments. We have tried to fix the referencing issues. Refer page 25-29 line number 493- 637.

Comment 3: Gender and Experience are each missing arrows to constructs in Figure 1. Opted
Answer: Thank you. Based on the given comment we connect moderating gender with computer. But not the connection between Experiences with performance expectance because we adopt the theoretical frame work from what we got in the different literature and we tried to
hypothesize the connection between them but no literature supports the relationship between
them.

Comment 4: Page 8 lines 163 - appears "customers" should be "purchasers."
Answer: Thank you. Based on the given comment we replace customer with purchasers as per
the recommendation. Refer page 7 line number 153.

Comment 5: Table 3: "intention to use EMRs" is unexpectedly included in a row.
Answer: Thank you for comment. Sorry for the inconvenience. We corrected accordingly.
Refer page 13 line number 248.

Comment 6: Figure 2 remains unclear to me. Connections between IVs might be better displayed
on the left side of the IVs so as not to overlap with connections to the DV that could then be
more clearly seen on the right.
Answer: Thank you for the comments. We authors agreed to write the covariance in to the right
side of independent variables and to left of dependent variable. As you know the covariance
between predictors is affected by the relationship between predictors and dependent variable, it
might be better to write the covariance between predictors and dependent variable as it might be
difficult to readers when the covariance apart from the dependent variable

Comment 7: Table 4: Spell out SE, CR and also the meaning of *** for this table. (Why 3
asterisks and not one?)
Answer: We expand the abbreviations in the manuscript based on the comments. S.E =Standard
Error, C.R=Critical Ratio. We also changed three asterisks in to one. We mostly use different
asterisks to show the strength of the association between variables. Mostly we use three asterisks
when the p-value is less than 0.001 and one asterisk when the p-value is &lt;0.05 but &gt;0.001. But we can also use a single asterisk for p-value less than 0.05 as a rule of thumb. So, we
changed the three asterisks to one. Refer page 16 & 17 line number 298&9299 and 322&amp;323.

Comment 8: Inconsistent and confusing use of IV and DV as abbreviations. Sometimes these are
used and sometimes spelled out. Would recommend always spelling out the words.
Answer: Thank you. We corrected accordingly. Refer page 13 line number 248.

Comment 9: Table 6: Title should again reflect these are looking at Intention to Use. Explain
C.R. First row is unclear with P=0 and then P &lt; 0 which doesn't make sense at bottom of table.
Answer: Thank you so much for detailed review and comments. We made them consistent based
on the legends written on the bottom of the table. We corrected it and made it in line with each
other. Refer page 18 line number 331&amp;332