Reviewer’s report

Title: Acceptance of mHealth among Health Professionals: A Case Study on Anesthesia Practitioners

Version: 0 Date: 07 Nov 2019

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS:
Authors of this paper has tried to capture the user experience for a mobile application meant for anesthesia practitioners both trainee and specialist.

They have collected the required response through a survey form from 349 respondents. The survey form have two major segment for collecting data: apps and peripherals, which further collects information about dosage calculation, digital books, perioperative monitoring, interactive anatomy models. Though the overall information captured by the study is quite useful for mobile app developers for health professionals, the study is not comprehensive there is a lot of scope for improving the paper.
Authors have rightly pointed that most of the mobile apps for heath professional should go through the validation check done by some competing agencies to ensure the reliability of such apps usage by the health professional.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
1. The approach of the study is generic in nature and in my opinion the title of the paper should be "Acceptance of mHealth amon health professionals: A case study on anesthesia practitioiners"

2. There are some typos in the paper, for example, on page 4, line number 19. It should be 150,000 instead of 150.000. And again on page 4, line number 21. The value in bracket should be 0.1% instead of 0,1%.

3. Related work is quite shallow (only one major paper has been referred to by Green et al.,) and authors should consider more related papers and emphasise why their study is required.

4. Authors have narrated the same inference which is available in the diagrams. It simply adds to the redundant information.

5. This study may greatly helps the developers of mobile applications for health professional to know the expectation and develop the app to meet the end user expectation. Authors should have used the tools to quantify the user experience.

6. Authors are advised to go through the book by Jeff Sauro and James R Lewis on "Quantifying the User Experience: Practical Statistics for User Research" or any other book on similar topic to acquire the required tools to analyze their data and come up statistically significant and relevant results.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The required revision details are given above.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.  
No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.  
No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.  
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.  
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:  
Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests  
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below.  
If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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