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Reviewer's report:

I like the idea of using PQoC as the key outcome.

The way that the 9 hypotheses are presented and described is hard work for the average reader. As far as I can see there are main variables PQoC, TTF, utilization, Task, Technology and Characteristics. These could be presented as a logic model as a simplification of Figure 1 (which is already too complex).

3000 iPads are in use. It is not very clear how many surveys were done. At first reading I asked is it 20 or 187. Also, it is not stated which year the data was collected.

It would be useful to describe the survey in terms of how many items etc. These items come from multiple sources, so it would be useful to have comments on the suitability of existing survey tools.

I regret I do not understand PLS. What does the acronym stand for? So I cannot comment on this area. PLS and SEM are not in the list of abbreviations.

On Page 14 line 331 and elsewhere there are missing references.

It is a shame that training and implementation management were not included in the model. I have been involved in an as yet unpublished study to assess the spread of an mHealth application, where the implementation approach (as measured using Carl May's Normalisation Process Theory) emerged as the key variable that affected utilization. This might be added to the discussion.

It needs to be made clear that this relates to hospital physicians (if this is the case).

I note that most of the references are fairly old (about 95% more than 3 years old). This is a fast-moving field.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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