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Reviewer's report:

Overall the paper is reasonably well written and will be a useful contribution to health research policy. It tackles a 'hard' issue facing health researchers - that of the dichotomy between research and practice and the seemingly inevitable lack of funding available throughout the sector.

I have some hesitations about the paper as it currently stands:

* New media is not new anymore: technology applications is probably a more effective and inclusive term.

* The results are probably somewhat self-evident. While the research appears to be conducted rigorously, I feel that we probably knew about these issues without the research. I would like to see more work on explaining WHY this research is necessary and what needs to change from a policy and systems perspective to ensure that this paper is leading the debate about structural changes to the system.

* While I accept that 'evidence' is necessary one of the biggest issues facing research using technology is that the rate of change is so rapid, codification is not feasible. The opportunity is therefore to change the rules of 'evidence' to suit the data that is available (e.g. use big data, secondary research sources, adjunct applications and existing third-party resources). This does not appear to have been considered by the authors who state that the time to publication is so long the research is out of date -

* The methods explanation is a bit lacking in 'narrative' about the necessity for a qualitative approach. I don't know WHY this is the 'right' way to approach this issue.

* NVivo is a tool for data analysis and coding data is done by the researchers (line 182). I would prefer to see some reference to theories as a result of the analysis. While the research is essentially descriptive, it does have implications for management, policy and systems. Each of these domains has theoretical underpinnings which have been essentially ignores for this research. The implications for practice and/or research would be much enhanced of these
theories were consulted. NVivo is also a very subjective analytical tool and I would like to see a discussion on the validation of the coding system. (there is nothing wrong with subjectivity but it has not been addressed in this section although it was in the data collection section.

* There are some difficult to read sequences of text that need clarifying. Lines:
  o 32-34
  o 110-114
  o 115 - thus that??
  o 169-172 - is too 'truncated' to be properly assessed for rigour
  o 175-182 - is too 'truncated' to be properly assessed for rigour
  o 184-186 - is too truncated to be properly understood
  o 205-206 - I don't know what this means
  o 209-210 presents essentially the same idea as the earlier sequence
  o 222-225 - this is somewhat self-evident and I would like to see some explanation for what this means for practice and/or research
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