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Response to the Editorial Team and Reviewers

We thank the Editors-in-Chief and the two Reviewers for giving us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript to *Implementation Science*. We strongly believe the reviewers’ initial comments and suggestions have helped us to improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following, we detail the revisions we have made to the paper in response to the comments made by the reviewers.

Reviewer #1

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Information about the ethics review has been added in the Methods section, as requested.
2. The development of the OR measure was an iterative process. First, as explained in the manuscript, we used the scales developed by Eby et al. (2000) and Rafferty and Simons (2001) as a starting point. During a brainstorming session, we adapted these scales to the particular context of CIS-based change initiatives. As presented in the Results section, the newly developed measure showed adequate psychometric properties.

Minor essential revision:

1. The manuscript was grammatically revised.

Discretionary revisions:

1. We concur with Reviewer #1 that “Technology Usability” could be considered as another precursor of clinicians’ early perceptions of organizational readiness. This issue was discussed in the Conclusion section. The article by Keshavjee et al. (2006) (provided by the reviewer) was also added to the reference list.
2. We agree with Reviewer #1 that future use of the research model might help elicit this issue.
3. In our viewpoint, the proposed model (organizational readiness) and the TAM/UTAUT models have different objectives. While our model aims to elicit targeted users’ early perceptions of why their organization is capable of withstanding change and successfully adapting to it, TAM and UTAUT models aim to predict individuals’ system adoption. As discussed in our revision, we believe the link between the two streams of research can be done via the inclusion of the individual readiness construct as a mediator between organizational readiness and individual adoption/resistance behaviors.
4. See point #3 above. Importantly, assessing the link between early perceptions of organizational readiness and CIS project success (individual adoption of the CIS) would indeed require a longitudinal design.

Reviewer #2

Major compulsory revision:

The manuscript was grammatically revised, as mentioned earlier.

Minor essential revisions:

1. As suggested, the research objective has been stated at the beginning of the “Research Model” (background) section.
2. We thank Reviewer #2 for this suggestion. We provided explanations in the Methods section regarding the rationales for conducting two distinct surveys.
3. As recommended by the Editorial Team, we did not remove the last two boxes in Figure 1.
4. We agree that we need to refer to “pre-implementation” instead of “implementation.” This change has been made.
5. We clarified the dependent and independent variables under the “Operationalization of Variables” sub-section.
6. Regarding the process leading to the development of the new scales, we simply added that this was done during a brainstorming session.
7. In our viewpoint, the methods used to assess the validity of the scales were clearly presented in the original version of our manuscript. Therefore, no changes were made to our paper.
8. We strongly feel that a statistical comparison of the results across the two surveys falls outside the scope of the present study.
9. As suggested, we eliminated the phrase “not shown here” to avoid any confusion and we improved the overall flow of this paragraph.
10. We also referenced sequentially Tables 3, 4 and 5 when explaining the criteria used to assess discriminant validity.
11. We reiterated the psychometric properties of the measurement instruments in the Discussion section, as recommended.
12. Comparison of our results with prior studies was not possible. To our knowledge, this is the very first study which investigates the construct of organizational readiness in the context of CIS projects.
13. We decided to eliminate the phrase showing a statistical difference between the two surveys for coherence purposes (see comment #8 above) instead of moving it to the Results section.
14. We are sorry about this ambiguity. We attempted to better explain why collective self-efficacy was found to be positively related to organizational readiness only in Study #2.
15. The last limitation was transferred to the Conclusion section, as suggested.
16. A sentence about the psychometric properties of the scales has also been added in the abstract, as suggested.

Minor discretionary revisions:

None