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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors present their paper as an exploration of initial user experiences of community pharmacists with a revised electronic prescribing system and position their paper in the context that user-centred design, if it had been employed, could have prevented some of the challenges faced by the pharmacists. Their documentation of the extent of user involvement at the early stages is limited, however, and allows little conclusion to be drawn other than users had little involvement. They then identify challenges pharmacists are facing but, since they have little information about initial user involvement, cannot accurately link these challenges to user-centred design or principles. In the end the paper seems to be more about the challenges faced with the new electronic system and little can be said about user-centred design. Perhaps the authors would consider rewriting the paper with less focus on user-centred design since so little information was available about this aspect of the system development.

For the aspect of identifying the challenges with the electronic prescribing system, the authors state that the interviews were semi-structured and designed to explore initial attitudes towards the EPS2, but do not provide any information as to what the interview questions were or the rationale/literature upon which the interview questions were based. There is literature documenting the challenges presented by electronic prescriptions and electronic billing systems for community pharmacists and this literature should have guided the categorization of potential themes and the interview questions. Without such rationalization and without the questions being provided, the reader is not left confident that all or major themes were identified. This concern is further amplified by the results sections: it is unclear whether the three essential user needs that were identified as not being met where the only themes and sub-themes identified within this research.

There are a number of grammatical and spelling errors throughout the manuscript that detract from the flow.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract: Method. Correct the sentence “pharmacies classified as classified as”
2. Background: grammatical errors in line 4 and 5
3. User-Centred Design: UCD is used without having been attributed to the term
4. Page 4 first bullet point: grammatical error (user’s)
5. Table 1 has descriptive information for only one aspect of each pharmacy, additional information must be available and should have been provided (that describes the pharmacies).

Discretionary Revisions

6 Please consider using the term ‘community pharmacists’ rather than ‘community pharmacies’. Pharmacies do not use a service, pharmacists do.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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