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Reviewer's report:

The paper is generally well written and has some worthwhile insights to advance our understanding of variance in perceived benefits of three LIS.

Minor:

P2 Ln14 …TO emphasize prevention….

P2 Ln 15-21 Content is choppy. Reword. Might be as simple as removing sentence on Ln 15-16 This involves……safe manner.

P3 Ln5-12 You transition from LIS into a discussion about EHR is awkward. A sentence to explain the relationship between the LIS and EHR is required.

P3Ln10 Refers to "low levels of adoption of health IT"….this is not consistent with the original citation. Change "IT" to "EHRs" and will be more consistent with source, and appropriate for this paper.

P4L19-20 You introduce the LIE abruptly. Please include a sentence on its role and utility in relation to LIS.

P8Ln3 Remove WHO

P15L1 You explain your performance benefits variance to differences in HIE capability, yet you describe the IEHR-LRV reliant physicians as located in urban areas. Could the performance be related to the fact that urban users are more likely to have encounters in more than one healthcare facility and thus SPs are more likely to access and use the IS, in addition to HIE capability? At the very least, should the conflation of the location factor be introduced rather than explaining it is primary due to IS HIE capability?
Your study included a parsimonious set of individual characteristics. Please add "individual characteristics EXAMINED IN THIS STUDY" to better characterize your results.

Your suggestion that "features" are a more "objective" measure of performance is still filtered through a lens of performance measured by subjects assessment of perceived benefits. I'm not sure that you've proven that your assessment of performance is more objective due to usage of any one of three systems with different embedded features. The paper would not suffer from the removal of this paragraph as the claim of better conceptualization based on features is not strongly picked up at the end of the document, nor is the paper dependent on it.

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.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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