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Reviewer's report:

I found this an interesting and worthwhile paper. In many respects, your conclusions make sense and relate to other studies which have championed a ‘whole systems’ or ‘sociotechnical’ approach to the implementation of eHealth.

Your sample is quite low – and I think you need to explicitly acknowledge/highlight this as a limitation. One suggestion would be to use some of the quotes from your supplementary files – these might help to strengthen your arguments – e.g., the importance of iterative testing.

A more important point is that I think your paper doesn’t cover some areas of other work on eHealth that are relevant. You mention ‘fragmentation’ for example on page 7 – much of the work from sociotechnical systems covers this and has argues that this is a big problem for electronic support for healthcare pathways – have a look at:


You mention at the end of the paper that you ‘analysed the sociotechnical factors. It might be worth looking at other work in this area as your ‘story’ is very similar to this work:


Eason, K.D. and Waterson, P.E. (2013), Fitness for purpose when there are many different purposes: who are electronic patient records for? (Invited paper for special issue on electronic medical records), Health Informatics Journal. doi:10.1177/1460458213501096
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