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Reviewer's report:

General: As the field of CDS can benefit from qualitative research results to identify critical success factors for CDS systems and ideas for improvement from both the clinical and vendor perspective, we really appreciate that the authors were able to work on our suggestions for their project. We think the paper has really improved, however some sections (especially the Methods and Discussion section) still need further clarification before it is ready for publication.

For a convenient arrangement of my comments I used the same numbering of the points as in the previous review. On before hand I apologize if the English I use is not always correct. In my agenda there was not so much time for doing this review so I wrote it down in a bit hurry.

Major compulsory revisions
Introduction – 1. Ok.

3. Ok.

Methods – 4. We really appreciate that there is more description on the RAP methods. This is essential to understand your results and main finding in the discussion. Although the information is still scattered and a clear list of all steps is lacking. Although reference 18 indeed gives more information, we think a clear summary is needed to get good comprehension of this paper. When reading the result section of your reference 18 I noticed that the method consist of six numbered steps. Perhaps it is an option to name and number all six steps in the first paragraph of your methods. An thereafter chose each step as a heading of the next paragraphs? E.g. step 2 are now your paragraphs on site and subject selection. It is also arguable to name all six steps in your method section with just explanation of there contact. And name all six again in your result section with per step your results. E.g. the different tools you developed are then described as results on the first step (developing field work guide).

5. The description of the grounded theory is really clear now.

7. A better description of the method and results for each of the six RAP steps (see 4.) could probably solve this point.

Results – 8. Ok.


10. Ok.
Discussion – 12. We appreciate the authors have put effort in rewriting the discussion section. However, some essentials are still lacking. E.g. the authors name the heading ‘Strengths and weaknesses of this study’, but they describe only limitations and no strengths at all? This section is really important to sell your research to the reader. E.g. Why is this research unique, what were strengths of your methods?

16. Also the Relation to other studies could be elaborated more, preferably in a separate section. E.g. name some results from other research in the field and how that related to your findings. The same applies to unanswered questions and future research.

Minor essential revisions

Introduction – 2. I expected some more expanding on why the qualitative approach is the best. The authors now state in their first sentence of the methods ‘Because little is known about this topic’ which is not really convincing. Perhaps they can use some argumentation from the paper I added. E.g. naming that they wanted to study tacit knowledge or some out of “human and social experience, communication, thoughts, expectations, meaning, attitudes, and processes, especially related to interaction, relations, development, interpretation, movement, and activity”. Anyhow name that they were interested in something which can not be measured by quantitative research.

17. Ok.

Methods – 6. I understand the authors as they say are proud on the rigor of their methods. So perhaps it is a matter of personal preference, however I would use some other words, E.g. “During preparation and executing of this study we tried to follow/ used/ founded on the RATS guidelines” or the like.

18. Ok.

19. Ok, however name this in the paper (we approached xx stakeholders and all agreed to participate in our study).

20. Ok.


22. Ok.

23. Ok, however name this as your first limitations in the limitations section of your discussion. It is used to start with your most important limitation, the one about the telephone interviews is least important, name that one later on.

Results – 11. Ok, however name this in the paper (that all collected data was categorized into the themes and used during the analysis).

24. Ok.

25. Ok.

26. Ok.

27. Ok.
28. Ok.
29. Ok.
30. Ok.

Discussion – 13. Almost ok, perhaps you could better follow the order of the themes as written in the Results (starting with A, etc.). It still appears to be a list of accidental chosen themes?
14. It would still be interesting if the authors could be more specific. The section Meaning of the study it the place to explain on your findings for clinicians, vendors, policy makers, and researchers.
15. Ok.
31. See comments under 12. and 16.

Table 1 – 32. Ok.
Table 2 – 33. Ok.
34. Ok.

Figure – 35. Ok.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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