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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editorial Board of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making,

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thanks for inviting us to provide a revised version of our manuscript MIDM-D-18-00365 “Are Austrian practitioners ready to use medical apps? Results of a validation study.”

We thank Reviewer 3, again, for the favorable evaluation of our manuscript. The comments were, helpful to improve the quality of our manuscript.

We indicated the very few changes to the manuscript using red color.

We hope that our manuscript is now ready for publication in BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making!

Sincerely,

Daniela Haluza (for the authors)

Daniela Haluza, MD PhD
Medical University of Vienna
Institute of Environmental Health, Center for Public Health
Kinderspitalgasse 15, A-1090 Vienna, Austria
Tel:+43(1)40160 34933, Fax:+43(1)40160 934936
Email: daniela.haluza@meduniwien.ac.at
Technical Comments:

No Consent to participate.

Authors` comment:

As in every online survey, study subjects gave their implicit consent for participation when starting the online survey. This is a commonly accepted procedure in web-based data acquisition. However, we added the following clause to put emphasis on this: “Due to the web-based nature of data collection,…”.

Editor Comments:

Reviewer reports:

Ting Song, Research Master (Reviewer 3): The revised manuscript is much improved. The authors put in so much effort for this piece of work. However, some grammatical corrections are still needed before publication.

1. Page 4 Line 1: as a characteristic feature
2. Page 5 Line 4: A US study …
3. Page 10 the next-to-last line: difference in
4. Page 13 Line 1: We found the highest average …

Authors` comment:

We thank Reviewer 3 for spotting the typos mentioned above, which we have corrected with the exception of no 3.), where we now state: “…statistically significant subgroup differences for gender and SHIP”. Explanation: we always refer to differences for the respective subgroup(s).