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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. The aims and question are well defined but authors need to be explicit that this is a pilot study. This needs to be explicit in the abstract.
2. Methods are detailed but largely descriptive and not referenced and adequately grounded in previous literature – the authors are requested to refer to methodological literature. For example focus groups – what is the rationale for this? How is ‘card sort’ method different to the Delphi method? Overall the methods section can be more concise and less descriptive.
3. Please provide an example each of the ‘fictional and non-fictional’ e-health applications mentioned under the ‘Assessing nurses’ tasks and information needs’ subheading.
4. It would be useful to know the total number of nurses in the hospital. Also in terms of context are there infection control nurses in the hospital? The journal is an international journal and we learn very little about the context – hence reducing transferability of learning to other contexts.
5. It would be useful to state up front the total number of research participants.
6. Can the authors please indicate who the researchers are at each stage – as usual convention using the author initials – and if not the authors to make this explicit – there is reference to others for data collection in the acknowledgements section.
7. Methods are repeated in summary in the results section – this is not required.
8. In sections the grammar needs attention and as such would benefit from a proof.
9. The screen shot of the App needs to be translated to English also for the wider audience

Minor Essential Revisions
10. A number of abbreviations are used without spelling out what these for example: CeHRes-Roadmap

Discretionary Revisions
11. In the methods section, the example scenario (Mrs Jansen..) and questions addressed by research participants could be presented in a box.
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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