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Referee 2
Reviewers report
Title: Differentiating Innovation Priorities Among Stakeholders
Version: 2 Date: 7 June 2013
Reviewer: Nicola T Shaw
Reviewers report:

Discretionary revisions:
1. Please label the BoxPlot x and y axis

We labeled the y axis of the boxplots “relative priorities”, and the x axis of the box plot “ICT innovations”.

2. Please edit the article once more by a native English speaker for grammar (it is much improved)

We sent the text to proof reading services Edanz, as suggested by the editor, to have the text edited. Edanz copy-edited the text of the paper.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Referee 3
Reviewers report
Title: Differentiating Innovation Priorities Among Stakeholders
Version: 2 Date: 12 June 2013
Reviewer: Kathleen Gray
Reviewers report:

Discretionary Revisions
A further close proof-read would eliminate a few remaining typos / English usage issues - e.g. "PDA’s" should be "PDAs"; "Well-fare" should be "Welfare"

We sent the text to proof reading services Edanz, as suggested by the editor, to have the text edited. Edanz copy-edited the text of the paper.

Minor Essential Revisions
1 Under participants, include their context, i.e. The Netherlands, if this is so (author affiliations should not be used to infer the national context of the research)

The reviewer is correct that this is relevant information. We have added the text:
Eventually, 62 respondents were included in our sample. All respondents worked in the Netherlands at the time of filling out the questionnaire.

2 The title would benefit from the re-insertion of "in hospital care".

We agree that this has added value to potential readers. We changed the title into
DIFFERENTIATING INNOVATION PRIORITIES AMONG STAKEHOLDERS IN HOSPITAL CARE

Major Compulsory Revisions
None. The authors have addressed reviewers' feedback very thoughtfully, to substantially clarify issues with the earlier version.

We appreciate this reply

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.