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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study to identify and test variables associated with the perceived organisational readiness for change. This study differentiates with other similar studies by focusing itself on the specific context of clinical information system projects and the pre-implementation phase. However, the research questions/objectives should be clearly stated not only in the abstract but also in the background section.

The methods are well described. However, the appropriateness and rationales for the methods need further explaining. It is important to convince readers why the two different cross-sectional studies are selected, their comparability and similarity for the purpose of hypothesis testing. Other minor comments are as follows:

Research model:
- Figure 1: the last two boxes are unnecessary as they are not part of this study.
- Page 13, the last two sentences, “Study 1 investigated the implementation of the mobile computing software in these 11 ambulatory home care units.” “Implementation” should be “pre-implementation”, otherwise it is confusing.

Operationalization of variables and data analysis:
- The authors should clarify the dependent and independent variables respectively.
- Five independent variables are measured using scales adapted from published studies while four are measured using scales developed by authors themselves. The authors should simply explain how they are developed.
- The authors should mention the validity methods for constructs.

In general, the data are sound and well controlled, well processed and clearly presented. However, the authors should report the comparison results of the variables across cases, if applicable. Otherwise, this should be explained in the methods. Other minor comments:

Psychometric Properties of the Measures:
- When describing the results of the preliminary check of unidimensionality, the authors should avoid phrasing “not shown here”;
- The flow is a bit confusing when the authors report “the results of the preliminary check” and the final results. The current organisation needs improvement.

- When explaining the two criteria recommended for assessing discriminant validity, tables should be consistently/sequentially referenced.

The discussion and conclusions are generally balanced and supported by the data. However, a stronger argument would improve the quality of the study:

- The authors should briefly discuss the validity of the scale items.

- The authors could compare the findings of this study with findings from other similar studies, if possible.

- P21, line 3, “In fact, this variable underscored a significant difference between the two studies (t=-1.3, p<.05).” should be in the results section, rather in the discussion.

- The authors should explicitly explain why collective self-efficacy was found to be positively related to organisational readiness for change only in Study 2. The current explanation is unclear.

- Discussion of the last limitation, i.e., clinicians’ changing perceptions of organisational readiness to change could be more concise since the authors have clearly stated this study is only focused on the pre-implementation readiness. Alternatively, this could be moved to the conclusion section as a future research direction.

- It would be theoretically sound to explore how the constructs interlink to have impact on the perceived organizational readiness to change. This could be acknowledged in the limitation.

The title and abstract convey the main findings of the study. However, it is suggested that the validity issues be mentioned in the abstract.

Finally, the writing is acceptable in general but needs Major Compulsory Revisions to ensure a higher quality of publication.
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