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Reviewer's report:

There are still some comments that should be addressed by the authors before publication. I would strongly recommend to take out the correlation (see comments) because I do not believe that the analysis delivers valid and representative results (sample size is too small).

However, I am happy if a statistician has an additional look on the manuscript to provide advice on this issue.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: acceptable
Conflict of interest: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reviewers Comments:
The Authors addressed all relevant issues and reworked on the structure of the manuscript. Hence, in my opinion, the paper improved considerably.

There are few comments left:

General comments
(1) Please check again whether all abbreviation are introduced (e.g. UTAUT, ED) and then consequently used (e.g. drug-drug interactions is introduced twice).

Specific comments
(2) page 5, line 18: I would suggest to mention in two or three words what the extensions TAM2 and TAM3 added to TAM

(3) page 6, line 5: Was this really a retrospective study? I understood that data were collected prospectively?

(4) page 9, line 11: I believe that anonymity is rather difficult to guarantee if there are only 9 participants of a questionnaire who all work at the same department and demographic data such as job status, working experience and computer skills are documented

(5) page 12, line 18: I do not understand how, if not manually, drugs were entered in the case sheet?

(6) page 17, line 10ff: I still believe that a maximum of 8 questionnaires or ratings (sometimes even less) is too few to perform a correlation that delivers valid and
representative results and would therefore strongly recommend to take this part off the manuscript until more data are available (including the respective paragraphs in the methods and discussion section).

(7) page 20, line 1: Is self-reported utilization really that low? I thought that 8 participants (from 9) indicated to use at least the digital case sheet daily or weekly?

(8) page 20, line 13: How do you define Hawthorne effect in this context - wouldn't that imply that usage of any intervention was higher during the observation period than in reality?

(9) page 26, line 7: The conclusion section seems to be a bit long - is it possible to shorten that paragraph and emphasize on the main summary points?