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Reviewer's report:

Strengths:

1. The paper is well written.

2. Problems, motivations, and objective that justified a need of study are clearly presented in the Background section.

3. The development and evaluation phases have been performed in well-structured procedures, and the results are interesting and valid.

Weaknesses:

1. The paper is focused on presenting proposed methods but failed in showing the earlier work done, related concepts, and contexts. Please review some current works done on development and evaluation of HIS/web-based clinical system in the Materials section. There are many works in this area, and you should compare their methods with your proposed one and justify why your method is more significant and valid.

2. The novelty of the proposed method is somewhat unclear.

Area for improvement (Methods section):

1. Why have you not standardized the use of Likert scale like a 4 point scale for quantitative evaluation of SPARK?

2. What is the basis to select these questions for quantitative evaluation of SPARK? Are the questions adopted from TAM? Are the questions chosen related to technical problems that required for SPARK design?
3. You can improve the reliability and validity of quantitative evaluation results. You must provide some more details about the reliability and validity results for every tested question.

4. How do you interpret the overall results? Is it highly accepted after SPARK improvement? Do you conduct follow-up or post-test after addressing all participants' feedbacks?

Area for improvement (Discussion section):
- The section is more on supplying the benefits from design and evaluation of SPARK. You should justify why your result is significant and highly accepted by comparing to the earlier works.

Area for improvement (Conclusion section):
- Have your study offers any commercial or societal impact? I am not clear of your study contributions to both theory and clinical practice, but the practical context is somewhat missing. To address the study limitations for better generalizability of findings, your conclusion also should provide solutions for future researchers in engaging more participants from different clinics by utilizing a random sampling technique.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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