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Reviewer's report:

General: The authors have comprehensively answered all comments of all reviewers. This has improved the paper. However, I still see one limitation: The literature work is still not very comprehensive - I cannot believe that your research is really so innovative, that nobody ever compared PDA versus pager - you should try to find comparable work (e.g. there are plenty evaluation studies on PDA that you could cite, some of them potentially also including mobile phone functionality), and especially discuss the differences to your results in the discussion section (not so much in the conclusion section!).

I also do not support your view that the weakness of other studies is that they were done in "controled conditions" - Your study is also a controled study. What you may mean is a kind of lab test versus field test, I think. And field tests are certainly better. But most PDA studies are field tests.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interest