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Reviewer's report:

The authors describe survey results of smartphone app usage in medical students and junior physicians. The manuscript is clearly written.

Major revisions:

The Methods section should traditionally be after introduction but before Results. For some reason, they follow discussion in my version.

Should include more details on how questionnaire was developed. What previous literature was used? Please cite the literature.

Please provide more details on data collection. How often was the questionnaire sent out? Was there an honorarium?

Please provide a copy of the questionnaire to ensure face validity.

Results – There was a poor response rate of less than 20% overall. This may make all results uninterpretable due to bias and could be a fatal flaw. This is mentioned as a limitation and a justification given that it is comparable to the literature, no references are given. This is a serious issue that needs to be addressed.

Discussion is very long and not fully supported from the survey data presented. Given the poor response rate and limited data from the results, it would probably make sense to shorten significantly.

Minor

The use of the term qualitative analysis is a little misleading. Some analysis was performed on the text boxes without the rigour of a full qualitative study using interviews/focus groups or ethnography.

The acronym BNF is unclear

There is a typo "medial" pg 11

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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