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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Reviewer Comments

Reviewer reports:

The authors' have responded adequately to the reviewers' comments. The issue now is readability and presentation. The authors need to turn their attention to the following items:

1) The authors have grammatical errors and typos that need be addressed. For example:
page 18 line 32: professors should be professionals
page 18 line 34-35 sentence beginning "Prior studies" does not make sense
page 19 line 5: The sentence beginning "In addition" uses multiple tenses and does not make sense.
Page 19 line 12: some focuses should be some focus
Page 19 line 29: could beneficial should be could be beneficial
Page 20: "Activity is the core of activity theory and implies the existence of a subject who performs the activity" This is so circular. It has to be changed.
And there are others - I just stopped editing them.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We have made all required modifications to correct the grammatical errors and typos of this manuscript. The revised manuscript is compiled and edited by another native English speaking person to improve its readability and clarification. The modifications are listed as follows.

1. The term “professors” has been changed to be “professionals” (line 6 of paragraph 1, section 1.1).

2. The term “Prior studies” has been changed to be “Handler and Lackland [11], Mourad et al. [14], and Schnoor et al. [15] have indicated that implementing multiple strategies rather than a single strategy…” (line 2-4 of paragraph 2, section 1.1)

3. We have rewritten the sentence to be “Larson [22] indicated that more attention should be paid to applying CPGs in clinical practice.” (line 7-8 of paragraph 1, section 1.2)

4. The sentence has been changed to be “Some of these studies have focused on solving comorbidity and multimorbidity problems [28-29, 34, 39] by incorporating knowledge-based techniques such as semantic web or constraint logic.” (line 11-13 of paragraph 1, section 1.2)

5. The sentence has been changed to be “Furthermore, Isern and Moreno [37] indicated that computerized CPGs could benefit clinicians and patients, but the systems were not yet fully integrated and implemented into existing careflow management systems and thus not used in daily clinical practice.” (line 16-18 of paragraph 1, section 1.2)

6. The section 1.3 theoretical foundations has been rewritten to address the circular problem in order to improve the readability of this manuscript. (section 1.3)

7. Other grammatical errors and typos of this manuscript have been corrected. The modified manuscript has been compiled and edited by another native English speaking person.
2) The style is uneven and sometimes not scientific. For example, Page 18 line 5: "some hospitals". Shouldn't it be "select hospitals" or "advanced hospitals" (based on comments to reviewers?).

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. The term “some Taiwanese hospitals” has been changed to be “some selected Taiwanese hospitals”.

The formula of "Author A and Author B [cite] found" is over used and actually not informative. Vary to actually say what was the important finding. Page 19 "Damiani et al. [22] confirmed that CCPG use significant improves the process of care. change to the findings" is a prime example. This sentence (with errors) immediately makes me ask "what processes"?

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We have made all required modifications to correct the grammatical errors and typos and the readability of this manuscript. The revised manuscript is compiled and edited by another native English speaking person to improve its readability and clarification. We believe the problem related to the over use of the formula of "Author A and Author B [cite] found" has been corrected to our best effort. The sentence of “Damiani et al. [22] confirmed that CCPG use…” has been changed to be “Although it was confirmed that computerized CPG use significantly improves the process of care [16], the development of computerized CPGs in Taiwan is still at the early stage and acceptance level among major users (physicians) of computerized CPGs is not satisfactory.” The process is process of care (line 12-15 of paragraph 2, section 1.1)

That is what is important less about the names. Lastly, in terms of style, the reviewers noted acronym challenges and the use of CCPG is still inconsistent. As a suggestion it may simply read better as CPG and computerized CPG. That way there is one less acronym. That is not a requirement, but a suggestion that might help readability.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. According to suggestion of the reviewer, we use the term “computerized CPG” to replace the term “CCPG” in this manuscript to improve the readability and consistency.

3) The theory sections are comprehensive but kind of a mess. First, there is no topic sentence to the theoretical background section. The reader just gets “activity theory” and off it goes. There needs to be a transition sentence explaining to the reader, in simple terms, what theoretical lens you will apply and why. That is it. That way I read "Ok you are going to use activity theory, TAM, etc, etc" That way when I get to the Activity Theory section I know why and when I get to
the TAM section I am not going "Hney, what happen to activity theory and why now TAM?"
The sentence that intros the Methods theory subsection 2.1 is actually very close to the idea.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We append a paragraph in the beginning of the section 1.3 to point out the theoretical lens used in this manuscript. The modifications can be found as follows.

“This study aims to investigate critical factors influencing physicians’ intention to computerized clinical practice guideline use through an integrative model of activity theory and the technology acceptance model. The major reason for the inclusion of activity theory is that the theory is often used as a practical and descriptive framework for facilitating the understanding of the interrelationships among activity systems. The use of activity theory can provide a research framework for analyzing the interrelationships among major activity components in the context of computerized CPGs. We describe the underlying concepts related to activity theory and the technology acceptance model as follows.”

We also reorganize the structure of section 2.1 to improve the readability and clarification of the manuscript.

In addition, the theory section is repetitive and actually hard to follow. Each subsection is not solely about each theory but blends. That is not bad, but the authors have to watch out for being repetitive. For example the sentence about Yusof et al [51] is nearly the same on page 21 and 23. The authors are encouraged to reduce this down! Thinking about comment #2, focus on the concepts and constructs not the names. Right now it fells like reading "A said X. B said Y. C said Z". If you tell the reader the relevant constructs and relationships from the theory then you could probably reduce that list feeling down to something more concise. E.G. “Three related concepts, X,Y,Z are all predictors of whatever [cite A,B,C]. It just needs to be tighter. The TAM section is better than the Activity Theory section.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We have made all required modifications to correct the grammatical errors and typos and the readability of this manuscript. The repetitive part in the theory section has been removed and the problem mentioned in comment #2 has been corrected. The modifications can be found in section 1.3.

All of the above applies to the Methods: Theoretical Framework subsection as well. Feels list like, not sure why this is different than the background theory section, feels like it has been covered before. Tighten up, reduce and be clearer.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We have made all required modifications to correct the same problems mentioned in sections of Methods and Theoretical Framework.
According to the reviewer suggestion, we have done our best to improve the readability and clarification of this manuscript. The modifications can be found in sections of 1.2, 1.3 and 2.

4) Do not end with limitations. Put before conclusions.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions and comments. We have put the limitations of this study before conclusions. (section 4 Discussion)