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Reviewer's report:

Toward the aim of evaluating the perception of mHealth applications and peripherals in Belgian Anesthesia practitioners, the authors successfully demonstrate the positive perceptions in this population towards smartphone apps and peripherals.

A few points within the manuscript should be clarified:

1. In the abstract under the results section, authors state "The usefulness of Apps and peripherals was rated 1 or below (on a 0 to 5 scale) by 9.5% and 14.6% of the subjects." Please clarify who are the subjects, to as to whom the 9.5% and 14.6% correspond? Additionally, and seen throughout the manuscript, when the authors use a "scale from 0 to 5" please clarify the meaning of the values; in the survey the only available guides to interpret this scale is as follows: 0 - Apps / peripherals will not improve anesthesia care and 5 - Apps will improve anesthesia care, but is not clear the exact meaning for 1,2,3,4 and at which value point of transitions from 'not improving' to 'improving' anesthesia care.

2. The authors use the term smartphone peripherals, but there is no explanation as to what exactly is considered a smartphone peripheral as a category

3. In the results section of the manuscript the authors discuss dynamic, and static calculation apps as a 'group of apps', however they don't provide further explanation of what this 'group of apps' means.

4. The X-axis and Y-axis of the figures are not clearly explained.

5. In the discussion section of the body of the manuscript, they state "practitioners did know of the existence of such products but found them economically inaccessible." There is no data presented to support this statement in their results, there also not further information on more detailed data regarding this, is it one participant, 10, 100 that stated this?

6. In Figure 1 the percentages shown in the results section of the manuscript do not match with the ones shown in figure 1.

7. In the results section: In interpreting the results of figure 2 it is not clear what groups fall under the
category of "anesthesiologists were positively confident". It appears that they are the subject under the groups 4 and 5 on the confidence level scale (0-5) based on a paragraph in the discussion section which says "considered Apps useful in Anesthesia (classification of 4 or 5 out of 5)". This needs to be clarified in methods and results if this cutoff is the one used, and if it is the one used for other results.

8. In the results section of the manuscripts, the authors say "From all responders, 45.3% actively used Apps to aid their anesthesia practice" and continue to show additional data on the use of such Apps until the end of that paragraph. Please clarify where are the output tables supporting this numbers?

9. In the results section of the manuscript, when reporting the results of figure 3, it is not clear how is defined "higher degree of optimism" is defined. If it's considered as it seems in previous figures (Scoring 4-5 in the scale) then the numbers should be for consultants 51.76% (not 51.6%) and for trainees 71.27% (not 72.1%). The same issue recurs in the results section of the manuscript, when reporting the results of figure 4 where consultants should be 45.09% (not 54.8%) and trainees 77.65% (not 44.9%).

10. In the results section of the manuscript, when reporting the results of figure 5, dose-calculating Apps (dynamic and static) should be 39.15% (not 39.8%), digital books 21.12% (not 21.5%), perioperative monitoring 20% (not 20.3%) and interactive anatomy models 12.39% (not 12.6%)

11. Suggestion: creating a section of the potential limitations of the study, where it is important to address the fact that considering 349 out of 2441 Belgium active anesthesia specialists responded (14.3%), this could represent a potential bias. Also, there is a potential limitation when classifying digital books as Apps, since there could be digital books as "non-Apps", and how this could potentially affect the perception of the respondents.
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