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Reviewer's report:

Information Systems on human resources for health: a global review

General comment: it is a good article

Specific comments:

The title reflects the content of the article

Minor essential revisions

1. Different parts of the article are not enough balanced, for example the background is quite long. The background needs to be balanced (shortened).

2. The article needs a rationale that including the purpose of the study before indicating the specific objectives.

3. When the authors talk about having made an adaptation of the Cocherane methodology, so it is important to say at least something on the adaptations and to indicate this in the discussion part.

4. The period covered by the scientific publications is long compared to the Grey Literature. This long period may not reflect the current situation of HRIS in some countries. If the scientific publications dating from the 1960s are significant in number, so they may wrongly influence the current situation of the HRIS. This aspect need to be discussed as not only a limitation, but also as a kind of selection bias.

5. When two or m or e articles were associated with a single count r y, which one is considered in the analysis? The most recent? Because several articles, both old and recent for a given country, can describe the implementation of the HRIS in the way of positive or negative change depending on the date. So this aspect of the long period of the sample, has not appeared in the discussion as a limitation.

Discretionary Revisions

Given the limitations of the study, it is also necessary to discuss the attainment of the goal and of the specific objectives of the study against the findings and limitations. For example for the last specific objective, it is desirable to give more elements about documented best practices to offer recommendations on...
how to improve HRIS.
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