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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript. This work utilized the Normalization process Theory (NPT) framework to assess readiness and expectations prior to an EPR implementation.

Background: In general, the background provided adequate support for this work. I struggled a bit with the term "electronic patient record (EPR)" which is not commonly used outside the UK.

Methods: The primary methods used were face-to-face structure interviews which many studies have done previously. This cohort was only 14 clinicians and staff which seems a bit small to generalize the results. The novel part of the methods we using the NPT framework. Methods mention "snowball sampling" which will cause bias in the cohort by reducing randomization in the cohort.

Results: Themes were obtained from the interview recordings and categorized under the NPT framework. Results were described in detail and well organized. May be beneficial to include a table or graphic for an overview of the themes rather than text.

Discussion: The discussion summarized the themes and discussed the impact of using the NPT framework.

Overall: The format of doing interviews or focus groups prior to a technology implementation is not new. Much work has been done assessing the impact on users of EHR/EMR/EPR implementations. The novel part of this work is using the NPT framework. I'd like to see more emphasis on that part of the study overall.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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