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Background

Comment 1- Should provide context… Although the additional sentence related to dissatisfaction improves the narrative, this new sentence that notes usage rates >90% seems to negate the phrase, "usage of the systems has been disappointingly low"

Suggest, delete the phrase: "usage of the systems has been disappointingly low"

Adjusted as recommended

Comment 2-

Suggest citing primary sources

I believe U.S policy for the HITECH ACT could be cited. See web site for Links to the relevant HIT legislation https://www.healthit.gov/policy-researchers-implementers/health-it-legislation

Citation inserted as recommended

Comment 3-

The background is missing a strong and clear definition or explanation of macro cognitive processes Good to see this included in decision centered design Para 2. The third paragraph seems to ramble. Perhaps the authors are trying to be responsive to reviewer's request for definitions, however the sequencing of information does not flow logically. Suggest revising this paragraph to be more concise.
We have deleted this paragraph. Although it focuses on a troubling issue, which has not been raised elsewhere, it is more appropriate to raise it in a forum dedicated to cognitive engineering issues.

Purpose

The sentence that I believe is untrue is: In our review of the research into healthcare information systems as summarized above, we found little mention of cognitive issues. "Cognitive issues" is a broad phrase and suggesting it is only the way they think of it, is not valid. In addition, the authors response that they are only referring the to the articles they read is not convincing.

I believe this problem can be rectified by removing the sentence and merging paragraph 1(only one sentence) and 2, starting with a transition phrase like " Notable gaps in the literature are a lack of discussion on how cognitive processing…..

Adjusted as recommended

Case study 1- I am still not convinced a more common or useful scenario does not exist; I leave this to the editors' discretion.

We have undertaken a literature search for a scenario that might be more appealing but were unable to locate one. Can we get a reading on this from the editor?

Work Analysis

Heading does not seem to be a good fit for the content of this section that differentiates expertise of healthcare workings and software engineers. Perhaps a quick definition of work analysis near the top will make this clearer.

We have adjusted the title and added a defining statement.