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Reviewer's report:

General
The paper reports on the evaluation of a bedside, wireless Internet access program. Any evaluation contributes to the evidence-base of health informatics, so I appreciate these kind of studies.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Please state very clear what your research questions were. It is somewhat unclear to me whether you want e.g. to explore the general applicability of this kind of technology at the point of care, or the general usefulness of bedside information access, or the usability of mobile tools etc. So what are your original questions? Your result and discussion section should then answer those questions.

2. Please make very clear what the state of the art is with regard to your study questions. So, e.g.: If you want to explore this hybrid technology, has it ever been used before by others, and with which results? If you want to assess the usability, then what is the state of research here?

3. It would be helpful to have more information on the functionality and layout of the software you used. You may decide to provide some screenshots and/or a more extensive description of the functionality.

4. You asked in your questionnaire about "clinical usefulness". A pity that you do not have any qualitative data (either from free-text comments or from interviews) what this clinical usefulness means. Respondents may judge "usefulness" very differently. You should assess this problem of questionnaire-based outcome assessment in your discussion.

5. In Table 1 - 7, please provide also the absolute numbers, not just the percentages.

6. Please provide the absolute and relative numbers for all questions of your questionnaire, to allow the reader both reconstruction of your questionnaire as well as detailed investigation of the answers.

7. Figure 1 - 3 are unclear to me: Which research question do they respond to? What is the message of those results?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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
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