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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor-in-Chief

BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

Dear Dr. Editor-in-Chief,

We are pleased, that you gave us the possibility to revise this manuscript for one more time. We truly appreciate the reviewers’ comments, insightful and constructive recommendations, which were a tremendous help during the revision of the manuscript. We also want to express our appreciation for taking the necessary time and effort to provide such insightful guidance. In revision, we have addressed each of these concerns.

We hope that these revisions improve the paper in such a way that you and the reviewers now deem it worthy of publication in BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making Journal. Next, we offer detailed responses to reviewers’ comments.

Best regards,

Dr. Muhammad Nazrul Islam

Military Institute of Science and Technology (MIST)
Dhaka, Bangladesh
nazrul@cse.mist.ac.bd
Responses to the Reviewer #1’s Comments

1. Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks and congratulations to the authors for going through the revision process and addressing most of the comments that were made. This is no small project for a lengthy paper such as this. My comments now should be fairly easily addressed.

Authors’ responses: Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions to revise the article. The other concerns raised by you are discussed below.

2. Reviewer’s Comments: I have not further comments on the first several pages. I will personally find the literature review very helpful for my own work!

Authors’ responses: Thank you very much for your comments.

3. Reviewer’s Comments: On page 18, just prior to "5. Stage III: User Study" I'm not clear about the meaning of that paragraph. You calculated a number of possible associations and found no significant results. The fact that one non-significant result is closer to significance than another is not relevant statistically -- they are all non-significant. I would recommend a simple statement (if any) stating that the tested associations were all non-significant.

Authors’ responses: We have revised the text and written a simple statement to simplify the texts.

4. Reviewer’s Comments: On that and the next page, I don't think spelling out the exact questions asked of the study participants is needed here. Perhaps another appendix? That section could be shorter, and all in a paragraph format.

Authors’ responses: The questions are presented as Appendix 3. Moreover, the texts of this section are revised and presented all in a paragraph format.

5. Reviewer’s Comments: On page 20, you state that "Taken together, most of these apps were found to have poor usability according to their SUS scores." When the majority were either at or slightly below the 'acceptable' level, that term 'poor' seems inaccurate. "Poor to marginal" is a more accurate reading of the table.

Authors’ responses: Thanks for the comment. We have used the recommended word in this revision.

6. Reviewer’s Comments: On that same page, I wanted to know more about how you determined that the SUS scores were inversely related to the number of problems. Was this just by looking at the chart, or did you use a statistical method in addition? If yes, was the relationship
significant? I didn't see the same obvious association between the two data sources that you did, just from looking at the chart. This question is also relevant for the last paragraph of your 'Key findings' section.

Authors’ responses: Thanks for the comments. We did not use any statistical method in this regard. The Analysis was done based on the chart. However, we have revised the text to make it clearer for the reader.

7. Reviewer’s Comments: That key findings section could be shorter and more focused on summarizing the very most important findings.....also I don't know what 'picturized' on the second line, page 23 means!

Authors’ responses: We have removed the word “picturized”. Also we have shortened the key findings section.

8. Reviewer’s Comments: The "Implications" section is quite important and well summarized.

Authors’ responses: Thank you for your comment.

9. Reviewer’s Comments: The "Conclusions" section should not once again repeat the methods, but rather just conclude with 2-3 sentences (eg sentence 1, sentence 6, and then another one or two about the use of these findings).

Authors’ responses: Revised according to your suggestions.

10. Reviewer’s Comments: "Limitations" comments should come earlier, perhaps at the end of the 'key findings' section, but not in the conclusion.

Authors’ responses: In this revision, we bring the text of limitations at the end of key findings.

11. Reviewer’s Comments: Finally there are still some English language edits that would be helpful. For example, 'disable people' should be 'disabled people.' A quick run-through by an editor would fix such problems easily.

Authors’ responses: The English language is checked and corrected.

Finally, we appreciate and are thankful for your time and effort to help us improving the article, and for your detailed and insightful comments and guidelines.