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Reviewer's report:
I wish to thank the authors for considering my previous comments. The manuscript has greatly improved in clarity. However, there are still some aspects needing revision to improve the text.

Major Revisions
1- In the Background section, the paragraph starting with « Today we are in the digital healthcare world… » could be shortened by providing only information relevant to the study context. The information could be presented in a couple of sentences, without providing details on the different types of ICTs.

[Authors] - Correction done as advised

2- The Methods section needs some improvement. I suggest using subtitles (Setting, Participants, Survey instrument, Data collection, Data analysis…) for more clarity.

[Authors] - Correction done as advised

The final number of respondents and response rate should appear in the Results. You should also make clear whether those 982 people were invited to take part in the study or if they accepted to participate, or if they filled the survey. It is surprising to have a n of 586 if 982 accepted to participated… Were almost 400 questionnaires discarded? More explanation for this high attrition is needed in the Discussion.

[Authors] Explained in the discussion

3- The sentence about construct validity is not appropriate. The fact that similar questions are used to assess a construct is not equivalent to validity… The sentence “Questions that are directed towards the respondents…” should be removed from the Methods. This is a limitation.

[Authors] - Sentence removed as advised

4- The sentence starting by “The final responses that were found suitable…” goes in the results, and the rest of this paragraph (“This is less than that normally…”) goes in the Discussion.

[Authors] - Correction done as advised

5- Overall, I question the value of the focus group discussion (FGD) as it looks as the topic was slightly different from that of the questionnaire. The FGD focused on the adoption of electronic medical record (EMR) in a single hospital. There is no description of the qualitative methods used to analyse focus group content. The results from the survey and the FGD are not properly integrated. For all these reasons, I suggest removing reference to the FGD.

[Authors] - FGD removed
6- The Results section should start by giving the response rate. I suggest placing the descriptive statistics of the respondents in a Table, and only provide some highlights in the text (Men represented 57% of respondents. The age group most represented was 26-35 years). The proportion of respondents from private vs. public hospitals should be adjusted to the total number of respondents in both groups.

[Authors] - Correction done as advised
The fact that more senior professionals did not participate much is a limitation that should be addressed in the Discussion.

[Authors] - Explained in Discussion

7- The definition of JS should not appear in the Discussion, but in the Background section.

[Authors] - Correction done as advised

8. The conclusions still has some elements of discussion.

[Authors] - Limitations removed to separate section. Recommendations moved to conclusion

Reviewer: Josue Mbonigaba
Reviewer's report:
Dear Editor
I was pleased by the efforts provided by the authors and the responses to my comments. I also maintain that this could be an interesting paper in this era of information systems technological advances. However, I believe the authors should make a paper focused to the objective.
1. The objective is to find out whether HIT is a factor contributing to job satisfaction (JS) and intent to stay (ITS) for health professionals. A focused and clear analysis would be for example to identify factors influencing positively job satisfaction and ITS and then provide evidence that HIT in turn influences these factors (or any other way of showing the effect of HIT on retention of health professionals). If the effect of HIT on JS and ITS was clear, achievement of the objective of the study would be real. However, the authors provide an analysis of many factors affecting job satisfaction and intention to stay using factor analysis and focus group. The paper looks like authors are trying to identify factors influencing job satisfaction (JS) and ITS which is not in fact the objective of the research. Otherwise, I like the rationale for the paper.

[Author] This comment has been addressed. Due to limitation in the study the authors could only study the effect of HIT on Job satisfaction in a limited manner. Explanations regarding why all factors were determined is also included.
The English professional need also to look at the paper. For example, it is not professional writing to start a sentence with a number. Eg: “566 nurses responded to the questionnaire” is not a professional sentence. [Author] This comment has been addressed
2. If other reviewers were happy with the revisions however, I would pretend I misunderstood the key argument of the paper