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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

In general this is an interesting and well-written paper with some valuable findings. I have the following points that could improve the paper's message

1. The Introduction provides a valuable overview of the subject material and the issue at hand. It performs a good job at placing the work in the context of what is currently happening in health informatics. However, it could have been strengthened by the addition of some international evidence, which apart from helping to establish the significance of the study, may also help to underscore the value of the findings to the international community.

2. The Methods section needs some more description of the technical systems in order to improve its value to professionals faced with similar issues. The authors should endeavour to describe how the system works, or intends to work, for whom, where it is being used and how widespread is its use.

3. The second paragraph of page 7 after the subtitle “Study Design” talks about purposive sampling based on site reluctance. This point needs to be clarified and justified. Did this design help the triangulation and validity of the findings? Did it provide a wider spectrum of opinions? How did the design link to the study objective?

4. Page 8 (paragraph 2) mentions a “literature-based, semi-structured facilitation technique.” This needs some sort of explanation about what it is and why it was used. Table 3 does not provide the explanation. The authors also need to describe how this technique related to the “deductive and phenomenologic epistemologic framework” mentioned in the next paragraph.

5. The Discussion section needs to be improved. The first three paragraphs seem to be providing more findings rather that answering the question and explaining the significance and meaning of the results. In particular, the authors should address the generalisability of their findings and how they might be applicable to others.
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