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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear EDITOR,

BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Many thanks for the comments on our manuscript MIDM-D-19-00203R1, titled “Merits, features, and desiderata to be considered when developing electronic health records with embedded clinical decision support systems in Palestinian hospitals: a consensual study”.

We are very pleased to learn that the manuscript should become acceptable for publication pending suitable MINOR REVISIONS in light of the reviewers’ comments. Many thanks for providing us with the opportunity to revise our submitted manuscript. Also we would like to thank yourself and the reviewers for the constructive comments which have considerable improved the quality of the manuscript.

We believe that all comments raised are legitimate and consideration worthy. In this revision, we have addressed ALL OF THEM and the manuscript was revised accordingly. We believe that the quality of the manuscript has greatly improved.

Please find below a detailed point-by-point account of the revisions made to the manuscript in accordance with the comments raised by the reviewers. All comments were carefully considered and amendments were made as appropriate. For your convenience, the amended text was highlighted in blue font throughout the manuscript.

Technical/editorial comments

1. Please rename “objective” (in the abstract) and Introduction (in the main manuscript) to background.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:
Objective and Introduction were renamed to “Background” as requested. Please see the amended headings Page 2 Lines 2 and Page 3 Lines 1. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

2. Please rename “materials and methods” to “methods”.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Materials and methods were renamed to “Methods” in the abstract and the main manuscript as requested. Please see the amended headings Page 2 Lines 7 and Page 5 Lines 1. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

3. Please move Supplementary materials legends to the end of the manuscript.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Supplementary materials legends were moved to the end of the manuscript. Please see the amended headings Page 40 Lines 1-7. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

4. Please include an “abbreviations” section after conclusion.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Abbreviations section was added after conclusion as requested. Please see the amended headings Page 18 Lines 1-16. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

5. Please add a “declarations” heading after the abbreviations section and ensure that this section includes all required sub-sections.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The following sections were added to the manuscript after under the declarations subheading. Please see the revised manuscript Page 19 Lines 1-21. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

Declarations

- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions
- Acknowledgements

6. Please rename 'Conflict of interest statement' to 'Competing Interests'

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The section is named “competing interests”. Please see the revised manuscript Page 19 Lines 13. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

7. Please rename 'Availability of data' to 'Availability of data and materials'

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The section is named “Availability of data and materials”. Please see the revised manuscript Page 19 Lines 10. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

8. Please include an Ethics approval and Consent to Participate sub-section under Declarations. Here, please clarify if consent was verbal or written.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Ethics approval and Consent to Participate were added. Please see the revised manuscript Page 19 Lines 2. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

Written informed consent was obtained. This was clarified under Ethics approval and consent to participate under the declarations and in the main manuscript. Please see the revised manuscript Page 19 Lines 6-7. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

9. Please add a "Figure Legends" heading and move the figure legends after "References" section.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Figure legend was added and moved after references as requested. Please see the revised manuscript Page 26 Lines 1-2. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 01:
(Stephanie Medlock, DVM, PhD, Reviewer 1)

1. I would like to thank the authors for their careful attention to the reviewer comments and their hard work in improving their manuscript. I feel the manuscript is much improved in this revision.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Once again, Dr. Stephanie Medlock, DVM, PhD is cordially thanked for her high quality constructive comments. Once again, her suggestions and recommendations have greatly improved the quality, clarity, and flow of the manuscript.

2. I have several small recommendations for the authors:

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

All recommendations were considered and the manuscript was amended accordingly. Please see how each and every suggestion was carefully considered.

3. The methods for the literature search are clearer now.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Thank you very much for your consideration.

There are just a couple more details to clarify:

4. "The literature search was verified by another researcher (PhD) who had previous experience in conducting literature search within the databases used." It is not clear what the 2nd researcher did. Possibilities include:

   - The 2nd researcher screened all the titles and abstracts, and independently included/excluded papers. Results of the two researchers were then compared.

   - The 2nd researcher reviewed the inclusion/exclusion decisions, and noted any disagreements.

   - The 2nd researcher reviewed only the articles included by the 1st researcher, and noted any disagreements.

Any of these are OK, but it should be clear which one you did.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

I would like to thank the reviewer for pointing out this shortcoming in describing what was done. This was clarified in this revision and the text was amended accordingly. Please see the revised
manuscript Page 6 Lines 15-16. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

5. Likewise, the sentence "Another researcher (PhD) compared the items independently" is unclear. Did the 2nd researcher look at the original articles (without highlighting), at the highlighted text, or look at the data extraction form?

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

I would like to thank the reviewer for pointing out this shortcoming in describing what was done. This was clarified in this revision and the text was amended accordingly. Please see the revised manuscript Page 6 Lines 22-23. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

6. It sounds like the interviews were recorded, and the items were extracted directly from the recording to a spreadsheet. Please clarify this, and clarify whether the researcher transcribed the relevant words from the interview or if they interpreted the participants' words to create an item.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

I would like to thank the reviewer for pointing out this shortcoming in describing what was done. This was clarified in this revision and the text was amended accordingly. Please see the revised manuscript Page 7 Lines 9-12. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

7. This method also introduces a potential source of bias which should be mentioned in the Limitations: the items extracted from the interviews depend on the researcher's interpretation of what an "item" is. However, sending the list back to participants for checking should have helped to mitigate this.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

I agree with the reviewer that this could be a potential limitation. This was added to the limitations as suggested. Please see the revised manuscript Page 16 Lines 33-37. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

Some additional suggestions:

8. The text "The decision to conduct a thorough search instead of a systematic review was made after carefully considering the following issues: 1) objectives of the current study, 2) nature of the research question, 3) problem/population, intervention, comparison, outcome (PICO), 4) scope, and 5) nature of papers/materials to be reviewed in this study [24]." can be better moved to the Discussion. The remaining text in this paragraph is a good addition.
AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The text was moved to the discussion section as the reviewer suggested. Please see the revised manuscript Page 15 Lines 13-16. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

9. The text "using the highlight text tool in Adobe Acrobat Pro (Adobe Inc. California). Sticky notes were added to the electronic copies of the records when- and wherever needed. Electronic copies of papers and reports retrieved were stored into a folder in EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia)." can be deleted. If the 2nd researcher only looked at the data extracted into the form, and not at the highlighted text, then it is actually sufficient to say that data was extracted into a data extraction form.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The text was removed as the reviewer suggested.

10. Since the literature search was not systematic, the authors/editors may consider if the details of this process belong in an appendix rather than in the main text. It is certainly OK to leave it in the main text, but if the length of the manuscript is an issue then this solution is acceptable to me.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The text describing the search was left in the main text. This could help other researchers who might wish to follow a similar method.

11. I would strongly recommend changing all instances of "consensual" to "consensus" or "consensus-based". Although the Cambridge dictionary definition of "consensual" includes "agreed to by everyone involved", by far the most common meaning of "consensual" is as the adjective form of "consent", not "consensus". Usually we just use "consensus" for both the adjective and noun (e.g. a consensus study, consensus recommendations); sometimes we use "consensus-based" (consensus-based core list, consensus-based core items, consensus-based items). The phrase "a consensual study" thus suggests "a study performed with the consent of participants" ... which is true but is not what you mean.

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

“Consensual” was changed to “consensus” throughout the text as the reviewer suggested. The amended text was highlighted in blue font for your convenience.

12. I would suggest changing the title to "Merits, features, and desiderata to be considered when developing electronic health records with embedded clinical decision support systems in Palestinian hospitals: a consensus study."
AUTHOR RESPONSE:

The title was amended as the reviewer suggested. Please see the revised title.

Habibollah Pirnejad (Reviewer 2):

1. I have no further comment. Good luck!

AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Once again, Dr. Habibollah Pirnejad is cordially thanked for his high quality constructive comments on the earlier version of this manuscript. Thank you very much.

Having addressed all the comments raised by the reviewers, we are looking forward to hear from you soon.

Best regards,

The corresponding author