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Reviewer's report:

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.

I have several small recommendations for the authors:

The methods for the literature search are clearer now. There are just a couple more details to clarify:

"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.

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?

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. 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.

Some additional suggestions:

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.

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.

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.

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. 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."

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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