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Reviewer's report:

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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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