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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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. The fact that more senior professionals did not participate much is a limitation that should be addressed in the Discussion.

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

8. The conclusions still has some elements of discussion.
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