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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making Journal

The authors would like to thank you and the reviewers for the review of our manuscript entitled "Technical Requirements Framework of Hospital Information Systems: Design and Evaluation". In response to the extensive and insightful comments of the reviewers, we have modified our manuscript and are pleased to resubmit a revised version for publication. Thanks to the editors’ comments and reviewers’ comments, we feel that in this version the quality of the manuscript has been improved substantially. Below you can see point-by-point responses of the authors to the comments. In response to comments the corrections in the text was presented with blue color.

Sincerely,
Mehrdad Farzandipour
Corresponding author

Reviewer reports: Yahia Baashar (Reviewer 1):
1) Modify the title - Make it shorter and more understandable.
Answer: The title was summarized to make it shorter and more understandable.
2) Add related work to the background - We want to know what has been done in this area? What are the current findings of the previous relevant studies? What does this study add?
You might reduce the background in order to add the related work to it.
Answer: The previous works done were added to the background on the page 3.
3) Is it possible to reorganize the method section?
"first part… then first stage,,, second stage,,,“ is quite confusing.
Answer: The method section was reorganized and sub categorization was removed.
4) From where did you get the checklist of the requirements for communication service, system architecture, service security and system response time?
Answer: The checklist of requirements was extracted from the document published by Iran’s Ministry of Health and Medical Education regarding HIS assessment criteria and subcategorized by the expert
panel in four domains of communication services, system architecture, service security and system response time with more items. This mentioned in the methodology in the focus group discussion on the page 4.

5) Can you provide a full sample of the questionnaire please?
Answer: Questionnaire sample was attached at the supplementary files.

6) Kindly check the attached PDF file; I highlighted few things in yellow color, which just need minor exploration.
Answer: The highlighted things in yellow color were edited and the sentences corrected, on the pages 2 and 5.

Riza Theresa Batista-Navarro, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2):

1. The authors did not provide a sufficient discussion of the other methods used in previous work, to evaluate HIS. They mentioned that "a couple of studies conducted to rate HISs have evaluated some technical requirements...[21,22]". However, it was not clear at all how the authors' proposed framework differs from the cited previous work. This lack of comparison with previous work is the reason why I indicated that this work did not "include the necessary controls"; the paper, in its current form, does not answer the question "What does this new framework contribute/improve, that existing work has not been able to accomplish?"
Answer: According to other reviewers, additional related studies have been added to the introduction (page3) and discussion and the difference between the previous studies (References 14, 17, 21) and the present one was added to the first paragraph of discussion on the pages 12 and 13.

2. I understand why the results presented in the manuscript need to be aggregated (i.e., it is not ethical to remark on how individual HIS fared against the proposed framework). However, I think the authors should comment on whether per-company feedback was sent to the HIS developers/companies. In my view, the results of this study are useful if they can form the basis of improving HIS, and this can only happen if the developers are made aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their own HIS.
Answer: The tables of study results of per-company was sent to HIS developers/companies, and mentioned at the end of the conclusion section on the page 17.

4. In terms of presentation: I don't think the last column in each of Tables 2-5 is necessary.
Answer: The last columns of Tables 2-5 were removed