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Reviewer’s report:

It is good paper. It addresses clearly focused issue of sufficiency of the eHealth workforce in selected hospitals in Ghana. The assessment combined two methods: WHO's Workload Indicator of Staffing Needs (WISN) method and a qualitative data using an interview.

The authors concluded that the paper provides a pathway for policymakers and health system managers in LMICs to manage their eHealth systems, including required eHealth workforce, but one of the main limitations of the findings is the generalisability of the findings in LMICS as the authors pretend. This needs to be nuanced.

It could be better to dissociate the WISN method description and the results (table2).

Setting minimum workload pressure of 0.7 needs further discussion not only as a limitation of the study (lack of evidence supporting that) but also as policy implication. 30% of shortage of required eHealth worker may not be adequate at any settings.

Study setting: to provide more details on the selection criteria of choosing the hospitals and the study sites

The description of the hospitals and the WISN method are long. This can be shortened. The details on WISN method can be found in the WHO documents online. A Summary of the method with relevant references can be enough. Otherwise, more details or notes can be shifted in annex.

WISN method: clarity needed on the data the authors used in the WISN calculation:

* How the data on authorized and unauthorized absences have been collected in order to calculate the available working time? Did you apply the average AWT of Ghanaian health worker of 205 days a year? If yes, under which assumptions?

* Clarify how the activity standards have been set.

* Page 12: you have mentioned the time unit "25 inpatients per day". But this unit time is not exist in WISN method. I hope you may want to say "25 minutes per inpatient day" instead.
Page 12: If you are paraphrasing or quoting some sentences, please do it adequately or providing references. For example the sentence: "The standard workload is the amount of work within an eHealth work activity that one staff can do within a year." (Reference?). This is a definition given in the WISN manual.

Page 13, line 29: correct the sentence by removing the "and".

Table 2: it could be useful to add the activity standards of each workload component in the table.

Table 2. I think that the column IAS is expressed in hours. If yes, add "hours"

Qualitative and quantitative data by interviews: How the sample was constituted? What is the response rate of the interview?

Results

- Can you provide more clarity on the term "part-time staff" used in the WISN calculation. I thought that part-time staff hold short term contracts and have the same Available Working Time like the Full time staff. If it is the case, it could be better to call them "temporary staff".

- Page 21: 36% instead of 46% in the sentence "La was still short—46% below required capacity—when we combined full-time and part-time IT staff".

- Figures of the table 6 should be harmonised with those in the text.

Discussion: What does evidence say about your results?
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