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Author’s response to reviews:

Changes in manuscript “Advancing beyond the system: telemedicine nurses’ clinical reasoning using a computerized decision support system for patients with COPD – an ethnographic study” to BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making with submission ID: MIDM-D-17-00316The authors are grateful for the comments from the reviewers. We have considered them with great care and have made several amendments to the manuscript and we have also included written comments to editor and reviewers. Listed below is a point by point reply to the reviewers’ comments and suggestions with references to changes made in the manuscript. All changes in the revised manuscript are marked blue. We hereby hope that we have addressed all criticised points to your satisfaction. On behalf of all co-authors, yours sincerelyTina Lien Barken PhD Student Reviewer: 1 Comments to the Author 1.The concept of this manuscript is well but the authors need to re-present it to be clearer for the non-expert users. For that, they should re-write it with more details. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We have made changes in the introduction, adding definitions of each concept to clarify the concepts for non-expert users. We have also added some new references. See pages 4-5, line numbers: • 69-72 (definition of telemedicine added) • 75-78 (details of COPD, new reference added) • 87-88 (more detail regarding CDSS added) • 90-91 (new reference added) • 93-94 (clarification nursing TM) • 101-102 (changed “triangulation of methods” to “a combination of data collection techniques”) 2. It is not organized in a good way so, they need to re-arrange it. For example, when I read the method, I felt confused so, they need to explain the method in details and clearer. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We have made several changes in the method chapter according to your recommendations, and added more details, and rearranged the method chapter. See pages 5-8. Line numbers: • 112-116 (design rewritten) • 118-166 (re-arranged the sections: “setting and participants”, and added details) 3. Also, there is needed to architecture diagram to explain the technical details for the non-expert readers. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We agree with your suggestion; therefore, two tables are added to explain and elaborate the technical details regarding the algorithm and the CDSS. See pages 7-8. Line numbers: • 144-146 (added a table to explain the questionnaire for evaluating self-reported subjective symptoms (Table 2)) • 165-166 (added a table to explain the algorithm of the CDSS (Table 3)) 4. Furthermore, it needs to explain the results in a clear way. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We have added additional details in the result chapter. See
pages 10-18. Line numbers: •223-230 (added details and re-written the paragraph) •349-355 (added details regarding the technological equipment in the TM setting) •388-399 (added additional details in the main theme “advancing beyond the system”) 5. It needs to a great contribution with some more reorganization. The authors: Thank you! Reviewer: 21. The paper presents the analysis of a nurse's work in the TM setting. The work is based on the description of the work of only three sisters. The conclusions are also based on this very small sample. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We have discussed limitations of the study sample in the discussion section. See pages 20-21, line number 487-508. 2. Discussion is too long, consists mainly from the citations. The reasons for not using always the CDSS recommendations are not discussed (Despite the fact that nurses have often advanced beyond the system recommendations). I suggest to shorten discussion, and to discuss the above mentioned reasons. Without it, the work is mainly the description of the view of the sister. The authors: Thank you for your comment. We agree and acknowledge your comments, and hereby we hope we have responded to them to your satisfaction. The discussion has been shortened, and more discussion concerning the non-use of the CDSS has been added and highlighted. We have also added some new references. See pages 18-20. Line numbers: •413-485 (the whole discussion chapter has been shortened, and re-written to further elucidate the reason for not using the CDSS recommendations)