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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript reports a study which explores the contextual and human factors that account for the high failure rates of implementation of Electronic Patient Records (EPR) system in hospitals globally. Based on experience of EPR system implementation of an NHS teaching hospital trust in Northern England as a case study, a Normalisation Process Theory framework is employed to identify the key factors that tend to account for the failure. The strength of this manuscript lies in the methodology employed and qualitative approach used to analysing the data collected, which provided a lot of insight into the issues related to EPR system implementation in hospitals.

Findings were backed by relevant quotes from the interviewees, which make it a very well written manuscript and interesting to read.

Given that about 5000 users are estimated to use the EPR system at the hospital where the study was carried out, a sample of 14 respondents may not be representative. This has however been acknowledged by the authors.

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.

Yes

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