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Reviewer 3: Mahesh Niroshan Fernando, PhD

This research paper is well written and addressing one of the most highly important issues in electronic health. Authors have nicely defined the research problem showing the importance of the solution to the domain of interest. Comparing and assessing the factors contribute to the failure of health-related information systems and points where failures could occur in systems development process are timely information for health information systems. Identification of the socio-technical nature of information systems is one of the plus points in the study. Using multi-method qualitative research design, authors have shown their depth of analysis. The method of factoring to identify positive and negative influencing factors based on the frequency and importance of mismatches is a good move. However, I wonder how the researchers have avoided the biases associated with qualitative data analysis. This could be easily answered by incorporating more facts to the analysis section explaining how many people independently involved with the analysis, how the analysis happened and providing the interrater agreements (for example Cohen's kappa coefficient) if more than one person involved with the analysis. Such improvement in the analysis section will improve the quality of the study since the factoring and identification of mismatches are the core activities of the study.

Response to reviewer 3:

Thank you for your review and we have addressed your request for additional information on avoiding bias in this research. We’ve added a section on validity in the analysis section: page 11, line 1-8, to explain our approach. The discussion also contains a section on validity, page 20, line 3-10.

Comments editor: Tony Rozan Sahama, PhD, MEd, MLaw, MPhil, BSc

It is essential to address minor concerns raised by one of the reviewer. Upon completing these requirements this paper will be considered for the publication.

In addition, it is necessary to justify "how this single Case Study" will validate the claims through this manuscripts.

Response to editor:

Thank you for your feedback and question on our article. This study and its results focus on a single case, directly resulting in the claims made using the methods as described. We’ve added sections on validity, as shown above, which shows more clear how the results were validated. I think this section also answers your question?
Let me know if there are any additional questions or requests.

Kind regards,

Danielle Vossebeld