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Author’s response to reviews:

23rd October 2019

Dear Editor,

Revision and resubmission of manuscript MIDM-D-19-00358R1

Thank you for your response and the opportunity to revise our paper on ‘Staff expectations for the implementation of an electronic health record system: A qualitative study using Normalisation Process Theory’. We have addressed each of your requests for further information below, which are cross-referenced to alterations that have been made to the clean revised manuscript, identified by line and page number. We have also added a number of minor changes to improve clarity.

We hope that the revisions that have been made to the manuscript better suit the BMC Medical Informatics and Decision-making Journal but are happy to consider further revisions, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.

Yours Sincerely,

Carolyn McCrorie
(On behalf of the authors)

Editor Comments, Author Responses and Manuscript Changes

1. Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Thank you for highlighting that Authors’ contributions to the manuscript were unclear. We have added a sentence to the section to confirm that all Authors have read and approved the manuscript [Authors' Contribution section, line 685, page 30].
2. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. We are grateful to the editor for drawing our attention to the role of the funding body and apologise for not making clear the remit of different funding bodies. We have changed the text in this paragraph to more accurately describe the role of funding bodies in the manuscript [Funding section, line 679-681, page 30].

3. Currently, the contributions of authors [OJ] do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below. We apologise for not making clear the contribution of authors [OJ]. The text in this section has been altered to more accurately describe their role [Authors’ Contribution section, line 687, page 30].