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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory
1. Abstract – When reading the abstract first, terms such as ACT do not make sense. Edit to remove abbreviations and increase clarity in results section. There are 3 measures you used – the RNAO BPGs, Nursing +, and Lexi/PEPID, but your abstract only mentions 2. For conclusions consider if your results truly indicate that accessing information resources supported nurses’ evidence-based practice. I don’t believe you looked at practice, rather just information accessing. A further study might be needed to show accessing evidence does impact on practice.

2. Clarify actual numbers in study, not just sample size. In the Abstract and Methods you mention sample size and response rate as a percentage; then numbers under results. This would help the reader make sense of your tables.

3. Methods – please clarify timing. How long after T1 was T2?

4. Survey development – please provide rationale for inclusion of the concepts and items chosen.

5. Did you pilot the surveys used at T1 and T2? If so describe this, and if not why not?

6. Results – You had complete T1 and T2 data for 504 participants. Is this all that you used for your results? It seems to read so. Please clarify.

7. Check table 2, as numbers do not match T2 numbers.

8. 97 did not use the devices at all. This seems an important point and needs to be explained.

9. You submitted 3 figures but fail to refer to them in text. There are figures for 2 of the 3 measures RNAO BPGs, Nursing +, but not Lexi/PEPID, why?

10. Table 4 does not include Lexi/PEPID, why?

11. Study implications – do not all seem to directly draw from your study.

Minor Essential
1. You need to be consistent with the terms you use. Keywords indicate “mobile computing”, so if you prefer go with this term, instead of mobile, handheld and portable, all which you use interchangeably.

2. Please check and edit your use of abbreviations and carefully follow usual
conventions throughout. This lack of attention to detail detracts from the readability of your work.

3. Multiple typographical errors – where you have table instead of tablet (in text and tables).

4. Check referencing and apply consistently. Journal title is in italics, not the article. Also Reference 11 – check second author surname. Inconsistent use of journal abbreviations.

Discretionary

1. Given you make the point about the participants coming from 3 sectors, it would be helpful to present individual characteristic results by sector.

2. Check dated reference ie Reference 25, Lacey 1994 – is this really the best reference here, given this work is over 15 years old.

3. I believe lack of choice of participation and also in device may be important but you don’t discuss this at all.

4. Under Background you note that the RNAO launched a best practice program in 1999. It would be worth explaining why funding of mobile devices is occurring 10 years later. Was there a poor uptake?

5. You are using 3 measures - RNAO BPGs, Nursing +, but not Lexi/PEPID. Suggest you state this clearly and maintain consistency in how you refer to them throughout.

6. The first paragraph under Related Literature would read well as an introduction. Much of the following paragraph does not seem to be directly relevant until you come to mention the UK work of Honeybourne. You report this work in some detail, but with minimal critique. It seems as though the sample size was small.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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