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Author’s response to reviews:

We would like to thank the Editor and Reviewers for their time and availability to review our manuscript. Their positive reception of our manuscript is likewise appreciated.

In an analogous format to the former submission, we hereby submit the revised manuscript. The provided feedback has been accordingly incorporated within this version. The modified text has been highlighted for ease of reading. Below we address each of the received comments separately.

Reviewer 1
N/A.

Reviewer 2
GENERAL COMMENTS: Authors have addressed all most all the issues raised during the last review, and incorporated the changes accordingly.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
1. In the discussion section, it is not advisable to start with four points, instead it should be written in such a way that it is obvious from reading your discussion section. However, it is left to the prerogative of authors to take a call on this comment.
   The suggested removal has been concordantly carried out. The text flow provides indeed the initially stated observations in a logical narrative flow.

2. I feel that some study on mHealth usage among health professional irrespective of the specialty must be cited and discussed in the discussion section.
   Thank you for the relevant comment. Indeed similar mHealth confidence citations within the anesthesia domain are lacking. The only up to this moment available study was already cited (Green et al). To fulfill your request, we broadened the citation scope and discussed briefly mHealth usage within the anesthesia domain without specifically focusing on quantitative confidence analysis. Considerations for user-centered design (UCD) and adoption within anesthesia training programs have been additionally mentioned. Considering the already considerable length of the discussion section, we did not discuss these facts in exhaustion. Should you deem further exploration feels necessary, we are happy to extend it.
Technical Comments

- Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated. Included.

- Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation. Accordingly included in the declaration section.

- Please, move Consent to Participate statement into 'Ethics approval and consent to participate' section. Moved.

- Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use. Provided.

- Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. Done.

- Figures should be provided as separate files, and each figure of a manuscript should be submitted as a single file. Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them. Accordingly uploaded.

- Please move trial registration information to the end of Abstract. Moved.