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Reviewer's report:

Review: Complementary roles of the hospital-wide electronic health record and clinical department systems

The diversity of systems in use in a given institution in the presence of an EMR presents interesting challenges and the current study’s exploration of these issues will likely be a useful contribution to the literature, after consideration of several revisions to improve clarity, connections with the extant literature, and potential generalizability.

Major compulsory revisions:

Introduction:
The introduction currently provides a good summary of the authors’ related work on this topic and would further benefit from the addition of a tighter connection with other investigators’ previous research on the topic, to complement the authors’ work and set the stage for potential generalizability of the current work. The study objectives may also be strengthened through a clearer statement of anticipated contribution to the field.

Methods etc:
The authors provide a good amount of detail regarding their approach to the interviews. The organization of this section may be improved through the addition of subheadings to aid the reader in processing the different subsections, e.g. setting, selection of systems, selection of informants. The discussion of selection of informants would benefit from elaboration regarding how these individuals were selected, including the authors’ judgment regarding how “well” they represented their individual departments/work roles. It also may be useful to have some sense of variability among these clinicians. E.g. were they all doctors, were nurses included, etc.

The limitations would be more appropriately placed in the discussion section, rather than the methods. Would the reader and other researchers benefit from including a list of the qualitative codes as a supplemental document with this manuscript?

Results:
The illustrative quotes throughout are very useful in fleshing out the different
themes drawn from the interviews. To broaden the potential generalizability of these results, it would be useful to include a clearer comparison/contrast of data extracted and synthesized from the interviews regarding differences between user perceptions of the CDS vs. HER, to give a stronger sense of why the CDS’s were preferred for certain tasks.

Discussion:

The discussion section does well with commenting on results of the current study; the import of this section would be further improved through a more detailed consideration of related research – how do the current results fit in or contrast with existing thought in this area? How might these results make developers and managers better at designing and implementing EHRs? Do the authors have any sense for how adding to the current EHR may help convert departments from their CDSs? The reader is currently left wondering about how these results might be generalizable, and how the themes revealed by the current analysis might inform future research and practice in this area. With these additions, the paper is likely to be particularly interesting to researchers and practitioners involved in design and implementation projects.

Minor essential revisions:
Throughout the text, it would be useful to employ a more consistent pattern of capitalization.

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