The reading mentions some advantages of using electronic medical record systems instead of using paper forms. The article provides three advantages. On the other hand, the professor refutes each of the reasons and says that we are uncertain about these benefits.

First, the reading avers that the electronic records are more economical than the paper forms. The professor states that this benefit doesn't seem to be significant. She mentions that the doctors still may write down any electronic records. They don't throw out the papers for back up. Also, for some legal reasons, there should be a signature on the papers. SO, they should still pay money.

Second, the reading posits that less medical errors will happen as a result of using the electronic medical records. In contrast, the lecturer opposes this claim by explaining that it's impossible to omit the probable mistakes due to the use of poor handwriting. She also says that the doctors should still use papers when they are examining their patients. The office staff should interpret what the doctors wrote on these papers. So, mistakes may happen even in the electronic format of medical records.

Third, the article claims that one of the benefits of electronic medical records is that they make are more easy for researches to use in their research. The professor refutes this idea and stays that researchers may have difficulties in accessing the medical information even if they are in the electronic format. She explains that they are strict privacy laws that make the access to the medical information hard for the researchers. Strict and complicated permissions are needed to access the information like the permission of the patients. Also, she mentions that the patients still can block the users. So, it seems that this method is not as beneficial as what the author poses in the reading.