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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Globally, this is a well-conducted study on a very important topic that has received little attention to date. However, there are some points that need clarification.

Major revisions:

1- The methods section needs to be more detailed. For instance, the sampling of health workers in selected hospitals is not clear.

2- Focus group discussion was only done in one hospital, but there is no justification to that.

3- The total number of questionnaires distributed is not mentioned.

4- The questionnaire validation process also needs to be described.

5- I suggest having a separate section for Results and Discussion. The Discussion would need to compare the results with other studies on the topic. For instance, there are several systematic reviews on factors influencing the retention of health care professionals that offer a basis for comparison. For instance:


There are also at least two systematic reviews on the influence of HIT on healthcare professional retention:


Källander, K., Tibenderana, J. K., Akpogheneta, O. J., & al. (2012). Mobile Health

6- Currently, the Conclusion is presented as a Discussion. I suggest removing the parts discussing the meaning of the results and referring to other work and place them in the Discussion. The Conclusion should be shorter and present the main findings with their implications for research and practice, as well as avenues for future work.

I have also some minor suggestions:

1- In the Abstract, please define IT the first time that it is used.
2- On page 4, please define “lac” (6 lac physicians, 10 lac nurses, 2 lac dentists).
3- On page 5, the assertions in the last part of the 1st paragraph (starting with: Healthcare professionals perception and attitude…) need references.
4- On page 9, the sentence “57% of the respondents who took part in the study were men rest women » is incomplete.
5- On page 11, I’m not sure to understand the factor “hygiene factors (financial and non financial benefits)”. The term “hygiene” sounds more like cleanliness than work benefits…
6- The references need to be checked because the style is unequal.
7- The Figures 1 and 2 are difficult to read (at least in the version I have reviewed).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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