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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript, the authors used two approaches to evaluate an electronic prescribing (EP) system. First, the computer screen was divided into four quadrants and the electronic prescription process was divided into six steps, and an eye-gaze tracking approach was use to evaluate the attention level (i.e. duration of concentration) with respect to each of the quadrants at each step. Second, users' comments were gathered through think-aloud method and interview. The current study demonstrated the feasibility of using eye-gaze to evaluate EP system, which is both novel and promising. My concerns are about the clinical utility of the knowledge learned from this study, and how to upscale the current study. Here are my comments: Could the author demonstrate that the level of attention during electronic prescription to be a surrogate marker for the desired clinical outcome (i.e. allergic events). With a smaller sample size (i.e. the prescriber), a self-controlled study using pseudo patients would be appropriate. What is the relationship between the users' comments and the clinical outcome? Could the author demonstrate that a causality existed between the favorite of comments and clinical outcome?

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.

No

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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