Reviewer's report

Title: The Status of IT Service Management in Health Care - ITIL in selected European Countries

Version: 1 Date: 25 April 2011

Reviewer: Miguel Mira da Silva

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential Revisions

1. It's not clear how the return rate can affect the results, in particular if there is any bias. For example, are the hospitals that answered bigger than those that not answered? If yes, maybe the reality is even worse since the results obtained only show the better part of the truth.

2. Why are the countries/regions so important in this paper? Are the results affected by the "channel" used in the interviews (personally, telephone, online) and/or type of hospital?

3. The sentence "two out of 5 ITIL hospitals said that their expectations with regard to the benefits of ITIL were not met" is not supported by data in the Results section.

4. Some minor typos -- such as "95 %" (instead of 95%) and "two-third" instead of two-thirds -- as well as captions separated from their tables/figures.

5. In the discussion it's not obvious at all that "one precondition to promote ITIL is further training" since one can argue exactly the opposite. In fact, this is probably a "chicken and egg" problem.

Discretionary Revisions

4. It's a pity you did not ask which were the "different priorities" in the question about the major reasons to not introduce ITIL. This answer is fundamental to this research area.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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