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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes a new mobile application which will be of interest to medical students, clinicians and others in the field of medical technology.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) The authors have described their survey instrument and included some of the feedback they received (Figure 21 and “Application survey” in the results section). However, the presentation of the actual survey results is very weak for the following reasons. Firstly, there is no mention of the actual numbers for group averages mentioned in the text of the results section. Secondly, the authors have begun to compare students to professionals in vague descriptive terms however this would benefit from statistical comparison. Thirdly, there is no mention of the strength of their survey instrument e.g. a Cronbach alpha. Fourth, there are results mentioned in the abstract (i.e. Twitter followers and website views) which don’t appear in the main body of the results. Fifth, the methods section doesn’t describe how the survey results were actually obtained. Lastly, the bulk of the results section is a repeat of the methods rather than actual results on the Application’s performance.

Minor revisions:

1) The authors have identified that another mobile application exists however in order to present this work as innovative they need to describe how their application is different from the iSurf Brainview. There are also several other programs which use digital 3d images of the brain (not MRI based) that would be useful to pay heed to in order to fully describe how their application fits into the field of mobile neuroanatomy education.

2) I was unable to find this software on the internet using standard search engines and so am unable to comment on aspects of usability. Some direction on how readers can access this application would be useful to include in the manuscript.

3) The quality of the written English is generally good however the following need to be corrected in order to be grammatically correct:
   Introduction paragraph 3 – “in recent times” – recently
   Introduction paragraph 6 – “Not many applications” – few applications
Method paragraph 3 – “dictate plain texts” – text
Method paragraph 6 – “One the one hand” – On. Also this is colloquial, consider using another phrase.
Help module – “last but not least” – colloquial, avoid
Conclusion paragraph 4 – “something to bear in mind” – colloquial, avoid.

4) The discussion makes unsupported statements such as the “outstanding interface” and reads like a sales pitch rather than a critical evaluation. The discussion also fails to make reference to any of the results.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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