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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.
   An elegant study, the authors address an important and relevant topic.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

The authors measure the time needed for running the analysis and printing the
results related to the drug-drug interaction but they did not include time for reviewing the results by a physician.

I suspect that this review would add quite a bit more time for assessing each patient. I can appreciate that this was difficult to measure and might be one reason why this factor was not included in this study.

The authors list this as a limitation in the Discussion but perhaps they could be more specific about this in the title, abstract and Introduction. I would think that when they use the term 'workload' in the Objectives and line 39 in the Introduction and that the title states 'The expenditure of time...' this could imply they carried out a complete evaluation of the time required to assess drug-drug interaction with the aid of a clinical support decision system—this they do not do in this study.

Perhaps the authors could make the title more specific by adding 'computer-related' workload ...

10. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes.

Comment: there are no figures associated with this study; I selected 'acceptable' as it is not possible to select 'not relevant'.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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