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Reviewer's report:

1. In the method part – the authors put contextual details of RCT designs for the main study. These details are quite useless for this study. Readers do not know when this pilot study was done, time intervals between the three reminder emails to respondents and how they knew who had not submitted their responses for sending the paper questionnaire.

2. The discussions do not cover other competing theories of information technology acceptance as well as the methodologies used in other studies. The authors did not discuss strengths or weaknesses of employing logistic regression for non-normal data of intention to use and used median for the cut-off point for high intention. By the time this paper is published, the authors may be possible to add more information on the accuracy of prediction model especially intention to use TMS according to the RCT of the main study.
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