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Reviewer’s report:

1) Two remaining issues I would consider major compulsory revisions. I’ve noticed that one of the reviewers (Mariette) included as a major compulsory revision the need to explain why a qualitative approach is the best to use in this study. Although the authors state in their reply that they have described the benefits of a qualitative approach and why it was used, I didn’t find much evidence of this. I would want the authors to provide more detail.

2) Concerning my comments, I think the authors have provided sufficient information about why they used an ad hoc approach to data collection and have also addressed other points with one exception, which I also consider a major compulsory revision. I still would like to know more about the characteristics of the people they interviewed and observed. For example, although they claim to have 'made an effort to seek out clinical champions, normal users, and skeptical users', there is no way to evaluate whether they have met these goals. They also interviewed people in particular roles and 'staff members who were most involved with CDS' but we simply have to take their word that this was achieved. Surely they have information of this sort and could provide it in the paper? I understand that people may have multiple roles, which may complicate things, but still you can classify people in more than one way when presenting their characteristics.
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