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Reviewer's report:

Interesting paper and important concept that development process should include the perspectives of end users up front. This is a small sample case report, and early in implementation, so the findings may not yet be generalizable, as the authors note. However, of interest to those involved in the development and adoption of technology.

I think some additional detail and context would strengthen the report and make it more analytical.

Minor/major essential revisions:

1. More detail on who makes up developer team? Arent there pharmacists on this? Were the activities of the development process documented, other than the notes from some initial meetings? Was the end user perspective ignored deliberately, or did the team believe they had sufficient input?

2. It would be interesting to link this work into a broader framework, that might explain some of the end user perspectives. For instance, adoption theory (Rogers and others) notes that several features must be necessary for successful adoption of technology (e.g. communication, organizational structure buy in, incentives, familiarity w technology, etc). Were these larger context items in place? It might explain some of the low adoption and resistance, in a more analytical way.

3. Tables: Why was there so much variation across sites? What are some of the variations in characteristics of sites? How were they chosen for interviews?

4. Recommendations other than involving end users up front? How to do this? What might work?

5. It is my feeling that there are other reasons for nonacceptance by some, and the ones listed here might be overcome by some of the context issues, such as incentives, improved financial coverage for pharmacists use of the system, etc.

Overall, this work should be presented in a broader adoption framework, to be better understood for its importance and generalizability.
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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