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To the editor of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Regarding MS: 1959312778212361 - Assessment of ePrescription quality: an observational study at three mail-order pharmacies

Thank you for valuable suggestions for improvement of our manuscript. We sincerely hope that the changes incorporated to the manuscript will satisfy the comments of the reviewer.

We are looking forward to having our paper published in your journal and have now revised it accordingly. Our revisions and considerations follow each comment below.

Best regards,

Bengt Åstrand
Ph D

Comments reviewer’s report version 2, 16 october 2008

Major compulsory revisions

1 Reviewer
As previously stated, the discussion section is lacking an incorporation of the relevant literature and does not detail how this study builds upon what we already know even if it is not directly from the outpatient setting. Although the authors claim that "...first studies on unintended effects related to e-prescriptions for outpatients" is probably true, there is still relevant literature that must be discussed in light of their findings. In particular, what do we know from other sites (hospitals and nursing homes) regarding computer transmission of prescriptions? The authors state that pharmacists recommendations were well accepted. They should cite some similar studies of health information technology (HIT) where this was also the case. Is there literature on SIG problems? In the US, standards for electronic prescribing have been adopted. Are there similar standards and would it help if similar standards were adopted? Also, although CPOE is a distinct technology, some of what we have learned from CPOe should be integrated with the findings here.
As written, the discussion section is lacking and is largely focused on limitations. It is essential that the authors take steps to write an informative discussion section making it clear how this fits with what we have already know in the broader area of computer generated prescriptions.

1a Author comment: A section (p. 15-16) has been added in Discussion on what is known in the literature regarding unintended effects of CPOE/computer generated prescriptions in other settings than community practice. Five new references have been added.

1b Author comment: A reference (p. 13) to a review paper on studies of pharmacists’ interventions with similar results has been added.

1c Author comment: A new section (p. 13) on the status and plans for further standardization of e-prescribing in Sweden has been added.
2 Reviewer
Although greatly expanded, the disclosure statement should make it clear who were the employees of Apotek AB. One way to do this would be to put the author's initials after this statement.

2 Author comment: The authors’ initials have been added to the disclosure statement as suggested.

Minor essential revisions

3 Reviewer
Table 1 is more clear, but still not readily apparent to the reader. The table should be revised so that "all new prescriptions" is the over-arching category with "new eprescriptions" and "new non-electronic prescriptions" as subcategories underneath it. The readers can easily figure the estimate of "all new prescriptions" by adding across the columns.

3 Author comment: Table 1 has been changed accordingly.