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Author’s response to reviews:

Ref: Re-Submission of manuscript (Id: HRHE-D-16-00193R1)

Dr Mario Roberto Dal Poz
Editor
Human Resource for Health

We are happy to learn that our revised manuscript entitled “Human Resource Information System Implementation Readiness in the Ethiopian Health Sector: A cross-sectional study” is potentially acceptable for publication in Human Resources for Health pending some essential revisions. We have made the required revisions and we are pleased to resubmit the revised version considering the editor’s and reviewers’ comments.

We have responded to each of the reviewers’ comments and corrected the manuscript in line with their recommendations. The detailed changes in the manuscript are marked with tracked changes in a MS Word document to highlight the changes we made to the manuscript. In addition, the changes we made to the manuscript according to reviewers’ comments are written in italics in the point-by-point response letter attached in the personal letter. We hope that our revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Mihiretu Kebede
Corresponding author
Reviewer #1

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #2: Thank you for considering my previous comments and revising the manuscript accordingly. It has improved a lot. However, I still have a few minor corrections and suggestions.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their kind comments and additional correction suggestions. We have considered their comments in our revision.

The manuscript still needs some English copyediting, please get it revised by some English expert.

Response: Thank you, we have copy edited the manuscript to correct choice of words, grammar and punctuation errors.

In the abstract, line 27 following it is not clear that these are two different questionnaires for different purposes.

Response: Thank you for raising this very important point. The questionnaire was one, the 32-item MSH HRIS readiness assessment questionnaire. The confusion was due to our write up. We described it twice and the reviewer understood it as two different questionnaires. We have revised the statements to avoid the confusion. It now reads “A self-administered 32-item questionnaire adapted from the Management Science for Health (MSH) HRIS readiness assessment tool was used to collect the data. The questionnaire includes items on socio-demographic characteristics, and questions measuring technical, personal and organizational factors."

In the background you introduce HR as abbreviation but in the following you hardly ever use it - please check the whole manuscript again with respect to your abbreviations. For example on page 15 line 45 you introduce IT although you have used information technology before.

Response: Corrected.

You have three objectives: the readiness, the associated factors and the challenges. Please make sure that you structure the methods according to this sequence. For example page 8, line 36
following is objective number 3 and should probably be part of the following paragraph (Data collection…) but in the right order. Also in that paragraph please check consistency with your objectives.

Response: Thanks. That is very helpful. We have made changes in the objectives and methods to structure the sequence according to the objectives.

Line 24 on page 8 is redundant to line 14 just above.

Response: That is true. It is now deleted.

You might want to think about to combine the two paragraphs on page 9 line 23 following and Data Quality Management as some is redundant.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s point here. However, the two paragraphs deal with different subtopics. One is about data collection and the second subtopic is about data quality management.

On page 10 line 24 it is still not clear how and why you adapted the WHO questionnaire.

In the results,

Response: By adapted, we mean that we have modified the questionnaire to adjust it according to the local context. We haven’t adopte the questionnaire word by word. We have changed some questions after the pre-test to make it clear for the respondents.

page 12 line 32 following you refer to infrastructure which is also reported on the previous page. Please check the structure of your results to be consistent with objectives and questionnaire themes.

Response: We have checked the structured and revised.

On page 15, lines 26 and 40 you should mention the qualitative interviews at first and not at third.

Response: That is true. Thanks for this important point. We have revised it.
In the discussion on page 17 line 50, what exactly do you mean needs further research?

Check the language/grammar of the authors contribution again.

Response: By that we mean whether having no fear of unemployment is related with HRIS adoption. We have revised it. Thank you.