

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Physicians User's Satisfaction with Electronic Medical Records System in Primary Health Care Centers in Al-Ain: a qualitative study
AUTHORS	Al Alawi, shamma; Al-Dhaheri, Aysha; Al-Baloushi, Durra; Al-Dhaheri, Mouza; Prinsloo, Engela

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Julie Lauffenburger UNC-Chapel Hill, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jun-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>There are a few unclear sentences in the methods of the abstract, and whether the student was approved by an ethics board or an IRB is unclear and missing. The study would benefit from some extra oversight for grammar and spelling issues.</p> <p>Another review with regard to the qualitative methods would be helpful. There were a few aspects that were beyond my area of expertise.</p> <p>Major issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Some of the information presented in the Study design section of the Methods should be moved to the Results section (e.g., the overall focus group attendance, the reasons given for lack of attendance, focus group size).-Were the focus groups conducted in English or are these translated quotations? Because of the nature of focus groups, it should be considered to provide the original quotations in the native language in the appendix to be sure that these results could be interpretable also by native speakers in the UAE.-The presentation of the quotations is a bit confusing. Because the focus groups were not videotaped, the inclusion of “(excited)” and “(all saying yes, yes)” seems to be inappropriate. It would be better to focus on words alone. In addition, some of the quotations do not appear to support the factors.-Are the physician-dependent factors (e.g., computer skills, training, etc) the themes? It is confusing whether the factors are the same things as the themes or whether these factors were part of the semi-structured interview.-Please provide a copy of the semi-structured interview guide in supplemental materials.-It is unclear how the factors relate to the themes and subthemes (were these determined a priori by the interviewers?) How was it decided to group these under physicians-dependent, patient-related, or system-dependent factors?-Figure 1 does not appear to lend any additional insight to the manuscript
-------------------------	---

	<p>Minor issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is there a citation for the quantitative study that was also performed simultaneously? That may be helpful in clarifying some of the methods for the reader. (Methods, 1st paragraph) -Acknowledging the purposive sampling strategy as a limitation in the discussion of generalizability would be helpful. -The information regarding the authors' contributions would likely serve the manuscript better later in the methods section, as the flow of information is confusing to the reader. -Were there any consensuses on themes that needed to be reached? How were these dealt with? -The description of Guba's four criteria (Methods) would be better served as an Appendix. -For Table 1, do you have any information on physician specialty or years of practice (beyond the dichotomous professional experience variable)? -The discussion should better connect previous research on EMRs (e.g., studies conducted even in other countries) and compare to the experience in their system. -Some more information on the operability of the EMR system employed in their setting would be helpful. -Some abbreviations are not completely spelled out. -Were the physicians compensated for their time? If so, that information should be provided.
--	--

REVIEWER	Dr Deepak Kumar B Associate Professor, Department of Pathology, Employees State Insurance Corporation Medical College and Post Graduate Institute of Medical Science and Research, Rajajinagar, Bangalore, Karnataka State,
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Jul-2014

- The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1-Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Done

2- There are a few unclear sentences in the methods of the abstract, and whether the student was approved by an ethics board or an IRB is unclear and missing.

Approval added to the manuscript.

3-The study would benefit from some extra oversight for grammar and spelling issues.

Done. The verbatim transcription of participant statements were not edited – please note although practicing in the English tongue most participants are not native English speakers explaining the grammatical errors in the quotes.

Another review with regard to the qualitative methods would be helpful. There were a few aspects that were beyond my area of expertise.

General Comments:

Major issues:

4-Some of the information presented in the Study design section of the Methods should be moved to the Results section (e.g., the overall focus group attendance, the reasons given for lack of attendance, focus group size).

Done

5-Were the focus groups conducted in English or are these translated quotations? Because of the nature of focus groups, it should be considered to provide the original quotations in the native language in the appendix to be sure that these results could be interpretable also by native speakers in the UAE.

It was conducted in English, I clarified that in manuscripts

6-The presentation of the quotations is a bit confusing. Because the focus groups were not videotaped, the inclusion of "(excited)" and "(all saying yes, yes)" seems to be inappropriate. It would be better to focus on words alone. In addition, some of the quotations do not appear to support the factors.

I removed them,

7-Are the physician-dependent factors (e.g., computer skills, training, etc) the themes? It is confusing whether the factors are the same things as the themes or whether these factors were part of the semi-structured interview.

It was the main themes; these categories of main themes were arrived at, at consensus, after the interview because whenever the physicians talked, they could refer to these themes.

8-Please provide a copy of the semi-structured interview guide in supplemental materials.

-It is unclear how the factors relate to the themes and subthemes (were these determined a priori by the interviewers?) How was it decided to group these under physicians-dependent, patient-related, or system-dependent factors?

-Figure 1 does not appear to lend any additional insight to the manuscript

it was decided after the interview under physicians-dependent, patient-related, or system-dependent factors as a main theme because when the physician deliberated they referred to these, I submitted the semi structured interview questions as supplemental data sharing document.

Minor issues:

1 -Is there a citation for the quantitative study that was also performed simultaneously? That may be helpful in clarifying some of the methods for the reader. (Methods, 1st paragraph)

Paper presentation at 2nd Al Ain Family Medicine Research day. Not published data available from corresponding author.

2 -Acknowledging the purposive sampling strategy as a limitation in the discussion of generalizability would be helpful.

I added that in the main manuscripts in the limitation field. (The application of purposive sampling strategy in the recruitment of the physicians during this study is also a limitation. Since the respondents were self-selected, might mean that this study had many EMR enthusiasts.)

3 -The information regarding the authors' contributions would likely serve the manuscript better later in the methods section, as the flow of information is confusing to the reader.

All authors contributed to the concept and design of the study Dr.Durra: was the moderator of the focus group. Dr. Shamma was the principle investigator and the coordinator of the study, Dr. Shamma and Aysha contributed to the analysis, interpretation and preparation of the manuscripts with the input from all authors. Dr. Prinsloo, Durra and Mouza were involved in editing the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, All Authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

4 -Were there any consensuses on themes that needed to be reached? How were these dealt with?

I copied this from the manuscripts: (Each transcript was independently reviewed and coded separately by all the researchers to establish main concepts. Subsequently, each transcript was analyzed by each investigator independently to explore the themes and subthemes and then reviewed by the other investigators to compare and group the similar data. Further relations and triangulations were analyzed during regular meetings. The next stage involved identifying the theme frame using the "Krueger" framework)

5 -The description of Guba's four criteria (Methods) would be better served as an Appendix.

Done referenced as Appendix B

6 -For Table 1, do you have any information on physician specialty or years of practice (beyond the dichotomous professional experience variable)?

All had started using the system from 2008 using the same system, we don't have the exact data about years of practice.

7 -The discussion should better connect previous research on EMRs (e.g., studies conducted even in other countries) and compare to the experience in their system.

Done

8 -Some more information on the operability of the EMR system employed in their setting would be helpful. Done reference 16, 17 added

9-Some abbreviations are not completely spelled out. I reviewed the document

10 -Were the physicians compensated for their time? If so, that information should be provided.

No compensation provided, most of physician was released during their shift hours

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Done

strengths and limitations of the article described well.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Julie Lauffenburger UNC-Chapel Hill, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Sep-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors appear to have addressed most of my comments. I did notice that there is a significant incomplete thought in the second sentence under Recommendations. That needs to be completed to
-------------------------	---

	retain the sentence's meaning. In addition, the Focus Group Questions that are provided are not actually a semi-structured interview guide. There are prompts already in the advantages and disadvantages, and it is just 6 questions. I would prefer that the authors either provide a more complete guide of how the focus groups were structured or refer to them as prompt questions instead.
--	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

I have changed the requested changes. I have removed reference 7 and corrected some punctuation marks and spacing. See track changes.

I omit the word semi-structured interviews and just refer to focus-group interviews.