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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions
I offer my feedback as a number of questions for the authors to consider.
1.1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
In identifying the problem as slow translation of IT innovations into hospital practice, how does the paper differentiate among decisions taken during different stages: review of options, investment in a solution, technical implementation, user adoption, diffusion beyond the initial site?
The background defines the stakeholder groups as payers (government policy makers and insurers), administrators (“managers” – what about differentiating between CFOs and CIOs within hospital management?), clinicians (segmented into doctors and nurses – what about differences among visiting medical officers, physicians in different specialised units, other health professionals such as pharmacists and radiographers?), and clients (patients – what about including carers here too?).
The background focuses the study onto stakeholder perceptions of cost / benefit, but needs to clarify if these are strictly economic or more broadly non-economic? How are these related conceptually to the decision criteria of investment level and distance from direct patient care? How does this conceptual framework relate to the literature? e.g.
1.2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Participants: When we consider that every hospital has a distinctive history / needs / culture, and when the authors have emphasised the “social setting of the process”, how appropriate is this study given that the stakeholders did not share the same hospital setting for possible innovation? Otherwise, how can the sample size and selection be justified as a representative cross-section of the regional / national health care system in question? (and can the reader be informed about what system this is?)
Measures: I wonder whether the inclusion of patient self-testing, in the context of in-hospital care, is sensible, since this seems the least likely setting where it would be implemented? See additional queries under point 7.
Procedures: How was the AHP was used in an instrument to elicit responses from the sample, and how was this instrument validated?

1.3. Are the data sound?
No questions here: text, tables and figures present preference, criteria and priority data clearly.

1.4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
[For determination by the editor of this journal]

1.5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

How do data (or other external evidence about stakeholder perceptions of their innovation options) support the researchers’ speculation on factors underlying cost / benefit perceptions? E.g.


1.6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Are the descriptions of innovations and the number of respondents the main limitations or are there also conceptual limitations?

1.7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Why are there no recent references to the use of AHP in healthcare to substantiate the choice of AHP as the best methodology to study CBA elements in stakeholder preferences? E.g.


1.8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Is this report better described as “Assessing Stakeholder Positions In The Implementation Process” or as “differentiating innovation priorities among stakeholders”?

2 Minor Essential Revisions

In general the writing is acceptable, however there are numerous typo errors in addition to minor problems with English expression; the paper and the references list need thorough copy-editing which I have not done.

3. Discretionary Revisions
Nil.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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