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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study that explored using eye-gaze tracking and the think-aloud method to assess user interface and on-screen design of an electronic prescribing system. Even though the sample size was small and participants only prescribed one medication, methodologies used in the study may be replicated elsewhere to produce valuable results.

Comments

Page 3, line 33: Think-aloud protocol was used by Horsky and colleagues in 2017 (Clinical reasoning in the context of active decision support during medication prescribing)
Please clarify why participants were asked to prescribe only one medication. Approximately how long was each eye-gaze tracking session?
Page 4, line 46: Please clarify why 68% is considered 'average' usability
Page 6, line 57: Please clarify how the cross-industry usability comparisons are made

Edits

Page 3, line 16: 'in relation to' instead of 'in response to' UI design?
Page 3, line 55: 'to prescribe for' instead of 'prescribing for'?
Page 4, line 2: 'we conducted a mixed methods study'
Page 9, line 1: 'enabling the need to enable greater…' - if possible, please replace either enabling or enable
Page 9, line 36-44: This sentence was difficult to follow. If possible, please amend.
Page 9, line 49: '...the degree to which these UI features play in influencing prescribers'…'
Table 4, Facilitating greater patient interaction: please clarify how the example quote is a suggestion for improvement
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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