Manuscript: **"The Challenges Confronting Computerized Health Records System Performance of the Pentecost Hospital, Accra: A Qualitative Study"**

Corresponding Author: Soro Dramane

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Kenneth Amoah-Binfoh, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Emmanuel Kumah

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Kenneth Amoah-Binfoh	
University/Country: Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received:06/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/04/2021
Manuscript Title: **ASSESSING CHALLENGES CONFRONTING COMPUTERISED HEALTH RECORDS SYSTEM PERFORMANCE OF HOSPITALS IN GHANA A CASE STUDY OF THE PENTECOST HOSPITAL IN LA NKWANTANANG MADINA MUNICIPALITY IN ACCRA**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0448/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u>/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u>/No You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u>/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(The title is clear but a suggestion to make it clearer, 'A Study on the Challenges Confronting Computerised Health Records System (CHRS) Performance of Private Hospitals in Ghana)	

Assessing would require additional quantitative analysis. Making it a mixed approach.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
(the recommendation seems to present findings, if it can be rephrased)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
(just a few places need some periods, and commas)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(The population of the study was not mentioned, one sampling technique should fit the study, the researcher employed purposive which is highly recommended, the respondents for the study were not mentioned, researcher should delete the last sentence which starts with, in terms… descriptive analysis method)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(the last objective, propose strategies to overcome the challenges, the strategies are not enough, but more strategies were captured in the recommendations in the abstract)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(is on point)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(Researcher should be consistent, in some references both APA 6th Version and APA 7th Version were used, researcher should employ one and be consistent)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**X**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Less literature reviews on Computerised Health Records System Performance in the country under study (i.e., Ghana).

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:11/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **ASSESSING CHALLENGES CONFRONTING COMPUTERISED HEALTH RECORDS SYSTEM PERFORMANCE OF HOSPITALS IN GHANA** **A CASE STUDY OF THE PENTECOST HOSPITAL IN LA NKWANTANANG MADINA MUNICIPALITY IN ACCRA**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5**

	[Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
The title is adequate. It is informative	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
Clearly presented abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
The language used is satisfactory.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
Clearly explained methos.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
Clearly presented results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Sound conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
Appropriate references	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is an interesting and well written paper. It has logical flow and will thus enjoy a wide readership.