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**Reviewer's report:**

**General Comments:**
This paper is very much improved, and provides interesting information that will likely be helpful to readers.

Several specific comments are listed below and should be addressed.

**Major/Minor Compulsory Revisions:**

**Abstract:**
- More information is needed about the survey. What was surveyed? What were the topics? What was trying to be assessed?
- The conclusions presented do not follow from the results. Results are describing counts, while conclusions provide other information. This is very confusing to the reader who wonders how counts moved to interpretation.

**Background**
- Smartphones are not the same as “other handheld technology”—this is a distinction that should be clear in the context of this paper.

**Limitations**
- While this section is much improved, comparing a response rate of 15% to 27.6% and describing it as “comparable” is a bit of an overstatement. More should be included to discuss representativeness, additional issues involving non-response bias, and other issues that are relevant given this very small survey response rate.
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