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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

To a large extent, the authors responded to concerns by adding/deleting tables/figures. In most cases, this was not sufficient to address the concern.

The sampling strategy for those interviewed is still unclear. The table provides information about who was sampled but would be clearer if this were also summarized in text.

The article continues to provide too little information about Microsystems in Healthcare - the guiding framework for the study. Adding table 3 with your codes is not sufficient. The information covered in the Background section is very broad and non-specific to the current study. Framing the background to introduce Microsystems and the change management/barriers to change concepts that were the focus of your interviewing would be one option.

Results - I find Figure 4 very confusing. Again, adding a figure is not sufficient. Starting your results section with reference to Figure 1 and a brief discussion of its components would provide readers with an overview of your framework. However, as I reviewed figure 1 this time around I noted that it was previously published in 2005? I am unclear as to how this framework both resulted from the grounded theory work reported here and was previously reported. This relationship needs to be clearer.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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.