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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our article. We have made the revisions requested in your comments, and have uploaded a revised manuscript with these changes. In particular, we have made the following edits:

1. "As indicated by our submission guidelines (https://bmcmedinformdecismak.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/research-article), please format your abstract to include the following subheadings: Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions."
We have reformatted the abstract to only include the four subsections listed above. We did this by deleting the Objectives subsection we had included and merging the text into the Background section.

2. "Thank you for providing an Ethics and consent for participation statement for your Declarations section, if you did not need formal ethics approval please confirm under the heading that this complies with national guidelines and provide a reference which supports this. Alternatively, supply a statement that says that a local ethics committee ruled that no formal ethics approval was required in this particular case. When doing so, please include the specific name of the ruling committee. If formal ethical approval has been granted for your research then please clearly state so, along with the full unabbreviated name of the ruling ethical committee that granted approval."

We do indeed have ethical approval for this work, but originally thought it was not necessary to include here as we did not end up using patient data. But we have now revised the text in the "Ethics and consent for participation statement" to include the local and institutional ethics committees that approved this work.

3. "Under your Ethics approval and consent to participate heading in the Declarations section, please clarify whether informed consent obtained from relevant personnel across the ETC who were asked the key questions as described in your manuscript had been written or verbal."

We have further revised the "Ethics and consent for participation statement" to include that we received oral consent to use staff responses for the questionnaires we had.

We believe these edits fully address the comments raised by your review. However, please do let us know if you require any further revisions.

Thank you,
Shefali Oza