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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. 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.

2. 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.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. 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.
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