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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions
   The method part is still a mixture of describing what you did, but also a discussion of why you chose certain steps and methods. This belongs into the discussion part or into introduction. The method should purely describe what you did, not why you did something.

   Example:
   Page 7: The amount of information a user can examine and process at a given moment is strongly limited by cognitive and perceptual abilities [14]. The physician therefore requires an overall idea of the new drug, from an overview of its main properties.
   Page 8: It has been shown [17] that standardized and consistent interfaces are required for users to be able to master their use without special training.
   Page 8: because it has been shown that users prefer graphical interfaces, which facilitate learning to a greater extent than purely textual interfaces [18].

   .......and more

2. Minor Essential Revision
   Page 2: SUS - explain abbreviation first time you use it.

3. Minor Essential Revision
   Page 3 provide a comparison of the properties of the new pharmaceutical product with those of existing drugs for the same indication, in terms of efficacy, safety and ease of use. - add “if available” after “existing drugs” – if no comparable drug or only placebo exists you do not provide data; as I understood, that is often the case (you said so on page 10)

4. Minor Essential Revision
   Page 4 : Properties of new drug – drugs – (plural form)

5. Minor Essential Revision
   Page 4: However, this would require them to read the evaluation report.... Add
that there are even other sources available “…. Or retrieve the information from other trusted sources……..” – there are drug committees or specialist groups, decision support systems…..

6. Minor Essential Revision
Page 4: This decision support system alerts the user to potential drug interactions and contraindications. It is a four-step system, with the last step providing access to the most detailed information about the drug. It was developed to decrease significantly the time required for doctors to obtain documentation about drugs. – there are many decision support system which help physicians to retrieve knowledge about a certain drug in a condensed form and thereby saving time; - please add that there are other systems available; what is unique with your system is that you compare to existing drug alternatives for the same indication.

7. Minor Essential Revision
Page 4: to facilitate appraisal of the potential value….. I would say it is the “evaluation” which is facilitated.

8. Minor Essential Revision
In the Method part: still a mixture of ”past and present tense”; page 12 We use specific font colors……. The ”serious drug-drug interactions” (SDDI) are presented

9. Minor Essential Revision
Page 30: remove Figure 2: it doesn’t add any more value; you have already Figure 3 and can describe in the legend what you see.

10. Minor Essential Revision
the efficacy of the new drug and its comparator, the table includes the values of endpoints measured in clinical trials and the probability value p………… please describe what you do when the endpoints vary!

11. Minor Essential Revision
Page 20: Our objective was to provide physicians (mostly GPs) with a tool enabling them to decide rapidly whether a new drug is of potential interest for use in their practices.

You should discuss, why you did not evaluate the tool within the GP group only if the focus group is GPs; additionally you should discuss, that a major task will be to implement the IT tool. It is shown, that many CDSS are not used appropriately or not used at all and alerts and warnings are ignored.

When should your tool be used by the physicians? Is it when he/she prescribes the first time a new drug for a patient – one should investigate the future usage of the tool. Please add that in your future investigation plans.

12. Discretionary Revisions
Your questionnaire evaluation just left the option to answer with a yes/no
alternative; you should offer more choices of answering – Likert Scales with an option of 3 to 5 choices are an better option.

**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.