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Reviewer's report:

This qualitative study of 28 participants (including 13 leaders, 23 primary care provider and 2 "rooming" staff) aimed to identify barriers and facilitators to use of clinical decision support in primary care. It largely succeeds. There are however some issues:-

There is insufficient information on the informants - notably age and/or year's in practice which have been shown to be important in the adoption of information technology.

There is insufficient information in the findings of the issues of adoption of information technology vs CDS itself the and integration between CDS and the EMR (both in sucking data out to populate CDS without the need for further input and in recording in the EMR information derived from analysis in the CDS (eg risk).

The use of percentages is inappropriate in qualitative research and because participants were heterogenous in type (eg leaders vs PCPs), non representative of a larger population and no evidence is provided of the response rate at recruitment.
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