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Reviewer's report:

[Summary of the Paper]
This study mainly investigated why a MEMR mismatched nurses' need by using a mixed-method research design in a Netherland University Medical Center. The primary findings indicated that the design parameters of a MEMR should consider not only fulfilling users' needs but also the potential impact on workflow.

[Strengths /Contributions of the Paper]
Different from quantitative studies, this study employed a qualitative approach to find the potential reasons for explain the mismatches between user needs and the design parameters of a MEMR. The obtained results from this study can provide as a valuable reference for medical facilities when developing applications alike.

[Comments]
This reviewer has no problems at all to follow the authors' train of thought. The topic is important and interesting to the audience of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. Two comments are provided for the authors.

1. The 'Analysis' section mentioned that this study used 'factoring' to find out how the positive or negative influencing factors. The authors are suggested to devote some space to discuss the process of factoring and how those factors were derived.

2. It would be nice to have a table to compare the main findings among Gagnon et al. (2012, 2016), Lu et al. (2005), and this study. Further insights may be gained from such a comparison.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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