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Reviewer's report:

General

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

- you have some focus on the differences between interns and residents. You should add this to your objectives and explain why you had a closer look at this.
- Pre-study survey: "60 physicians responded" - please make clear what the return rate was
- Post-study survey: 31 responded, but how many used the PDA, so what was the return rate?
- You focus a lot on pre-study internet usage. However, you should make clear that the respondents of your pre-survey are different from those of the post-survey.
- In addition, for general internet usage, a lot of comparable surveys are available, and you cite some of them (e.g. [5]). In the discussion, you should add a paragraph to show how your pre-study data is comparable/different to other surveys, to show whether your participants are typical clinical Internet users.
- do you think the abbreviation PostPGY1 is a good choice that is clear to the reader? Why not name it comparable ot the other group (Interns group) in a clearer way?
- In table 2, for the interns group, the sum of percentages is not 100%
- In table 1 and 4, the absolute numbers are missing (just the percentages are indicated)
- In table 4, please add the explanations that you had in the questionnaire (e.g. what personal information means)
- for alle tables: please add the information in case multiple selections were possible.
- Table 12: the title of this table does not match the question in the questionnaire "information was used" is very much different from "information has an impact"! Please harmonize the wording.

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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