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Dear Professor Roudsari,

Re: M S: 2073622835739826

"We are bitter but we are better off: case study of the implementation of an electronic health record system into a mental health hospital in England"

Thank you for your letter dated November 18, 2012 and the accompanying reports from peer reviewers. We are delighted to hear that the revised manuscript has received very positive reviews and we are pleased to submit it for your consideration. In revising the paper, we have taken note of the final comments of Reviewer 1 and the editorial steer and have made the minor corrections and adjustments suggested. Our revisions (prefixed R) are for your convenience summarised below in the order in which issues have been raised by reviewer 1.

Reviewer 1

1-The title 'Our adapted theoretical perspective' is an odd title. I suggest to leave out 'adapted.'

R: We have removed the word adapted from the title.

2-It would be more natural to address in the discussion section how a social construction view and performatory view relate to other studies, including my own (Aarts et al. 2004), and identify what the authors' views add to our theoretical understanding of implementing EHRs in a hospital.

R: We have revised the discussion along the lines suggested and have highlighted how our work has contributed to theoretical deliberations on EHR implementation in hospitals. These include:

- P.16, Paragraph 2 of discussion section where we discuss the constantly changing NHS environment, which resembles emergent change discussed by Aarts et al. 2004;
- P.16, Paragraph 3 of discussion section (with regards to performative view and social construction view raised by reviewer 1);

- P.17, paragraph 5 of discussion section where we describe EHR as both cause and consequence of longer-term processes of changing (linked to Aarts et al. 2004);

- P.17, paragraph 6 of discussion section where we highlight that our „sociotechnical changing“ framework enabled us to manifest changing as instances of both projection and remembrance, as a process or performance (performative view);

- P.18, paragraph 7 of discussion section where we mention that our theoretical lens led to explore more performative view than the image of discrete change;

- P.18, paragraph 8 of discussion section, where we describe non- or partial adoption but also rejection, misuse, non-use, resistance to EHR and workarounds, not as signs of failure, but as alternative enactments upon technology (linked to Aarts et al. 2004: making EHR to actively produce a fit system to the needs of organization);

- P.18, paragraph 9 of discussion section: "the „sociotechnical changing“ perspective helped us move away from static before and after implementation „in parts” or notions of discrete change, (linked to Aarts et al. 2004).

3- The quotes can be more succinct and the number lower.

R: We have further reduced the number and length of quote in the revised manuscript.

4- Journal references are not consistently abbreviated according to PubMed/ISO Standards.

R: We have now proofread the reference list and have made it consistent throughout.

Once again, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for giving us the opportunity to revise and through so doing improve our paper. We hope that these revisions are to your satisfaction and that we are now in a position to proceed with publication. Please do not however hesitate to contact us if you require any further information or clarification.

With kind regards,

Amir Takian, Aziz Sheikh, Nicholas Barber