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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting and perceptive paper describing the deployment of decision support technology. The study is well presented and logically structured. This helps the reader to understand the flow and conclusions of the paper. I have identified a few areas where I think the authors need to provide some more detail and substance to the paper.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. The paper draws attention to the gap between the “enthusiasm” for technological innovation, and the “actual practice of implementation.” I would like the authors to provide a more updated description of this “gap”. Some of the evidence provided for this “gap” is now over ten years old. Are the authors able to succinctly draw attention to any important developments, discussions, strategies about this issue from the last five years or so? I believe the paper would be better positioned if it was able to link into some important recent developments and thinking.

2. The “Research approach” section needs more detail. Can the authors describe how NPT is positioned in regards to other approaches or theoretical lenses? Is there a strong reason for using it? What do the authors think it will add to our understanding? This is important, because, I would also like the paper to provide an assessment of the value of NPT in the Discussion, in the light of the study’s findings.

3. The paper is currently light on the context of how (where and when) the technologies are used. There are some (very interesting) snippets here and there, but the paper is generally thin on the technological and contextual description of the system. Sometimes, a screen shot or a simple process map can help immensely.

4. The “Analysis” section conveys a strong sense of the rigour of the data analysis. Can the authors also explain what approach/es they undertook to build confidence in the validity of the data and their findings?

Minor essential revisions:

5. The meaning of the last sentence in the paragraph under “Research approach” on page 4, is not clear.
6. The point (page 8, paragraph 1) from Science and Technology Studies about how technologies are never fixed or finished, is an important one. It should be referenced.
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