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Reviewer’s report:

The question posed by the authors is well defined, and the components of the mixed methods design a clearly described.

The data are well described and reported appropriately, and the discussion and conclusions are well balanced and supported by both the study data and the existing literature. Limitations of the work are clearly stated.

While the title does not explicitly identify the findings, the abstract does.

Major Compulsory Revisions
In my view, there are no major revision required.

Minor Essential Revisions
(comments indicate Page / paragraph / line):
1. 2 / abstract-results / line 4: replace ‘that’ with ‘than’
2. 6 / 3 / 2: delete redundant ‘had’
3. 9 / 3 / 3: delete redundant ‘had’
4. 11 / 2 / 3: replace ‘describing’ with ‘described’
5. 12 / 3 / 7: replace ‘his’ with ‘this’
6. 15 / 1 / 2: replace ‘subjects’ with ‘staff participants’
7. 15 / 1 / 4: revise phrase to ‘… recorded in patients’ charts …’
8. 15 / 4 / 4: ‘Koppel’ is not reference 23 in the reference list
9. 16 / 1 / 1: replace ‘EP’ with ‘eP’
10. 16 / 1 / 3: incorrect reference number for Schulman according to reference list
11. 16 / 1 / 6: given the above referencing errors, please check that reference # 25 is correct for this statement
12. 16 / 2 / 2: revise phrase to ‘before-after’
13. 16 / 3 / 3: replace ‘could be’ with ‘was’
14. 16 / 3 / 5: add punctuation so as to read ‘… policy-makers’ questions …’
15. 20: reference 8 is duplicated as 21, so all references will need re-ordering
16. 21: reference 13, article title needs bold font

Discretionary Revisions

17. 7 / 3 / 3: ‘patients’ are included in the previous sentence, but the following sentence states all participants used ‘Meditech HIS as part of their work’. Please clarify / revise

18. 7 / 4: inclusion of the ‘interview schedules’ (with actual questions statements – or a sample) for each of the participants groups would provide clarity for readers.

19. 7 / 5: patients from the ‘elderly wards’ were interviewed, but review of case notes were not from those wards. Provide a rationale for this. Should case notes have been reviewed from these wards rather than paediatrics?

20. 12 / 3 / 3: the colloquial term ‘fell off the screen’ needs clarification for readers

21. 14 / 1: what was the time range for the actual interviews? (as opposed to the days spent in the site)

22. 16-17: ‘conclusion’ is long-ish (4 paragraphs), compared to a short-ish ‘discussion’ of 7 paragraphs – perhaps some content could be re-located to create a punchy conclusion

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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