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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** |  |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** |  |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **Abstract and Introduction**  **The abstract clearly summarizes the article’s objectives, scope, and main findings, providing a concise overview of the role, benefits, and challenges of educational technologies-especially mobile applications-in health education. The introduction effectively contextualizes the rapid growth of digital tools in healthcare and education, referencing relevant statistics and trends. Both sections**  **map out the article’s direction well, setting clear expectations for the reader.** | We thank the reviewer for the positive assessment of the abstract and introduction. I am glad that both sections managed to convey the objectives, scope, and main conclusions of the article clearly and concisely, as well as to properly contextualize the growth of digital technologies in health and education. We appreciate the recognition of the effort to establish clear expectations for the reader, which is crucial for guiding the understanding of the topic. We remain available for any additional adjustments that may further enhance the clarity of the text. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **References and Literature Review**  **The article draws on a wide range of up-to-date and relevant references, including systematic reviews, international guidelines, and recent studies. The literature review is comprehensive, covering the evolution of e-Health and m-Health, their adoption in various countries, and their pedagogical implications. It also discusses the classification of health technologies and reviews the main types of educational tools and their impact on health teaching. The references are current and appropriate, supporting the article’s arguments and demonstrating thorough engagement with the field.**  **Data and Results Presentation**  **The article presents synthesized data from the literature clearly, using charts and tables to summarize key concepts such as types of technological tools, validation criteria, and development methodologies. This structured presentation aids comprehension and allows readers to quickly grasp essential information. The discussion of challenges (e.g., lack of rigorous validation, usability issues)**  **is balanced by highlighting benefits and best practices.**  **Non-Scientific Evidence and Analyses**  **The review incorporates non-scientific evidence, such as trends in app downloads, generational shifts in learning preferences, and anecdotal reports of user experiences. These analyses are used judiciously to supplement scientific findings and provide context, especially regarding the practical challenges faced by students and educators.** | We thank the reviewer for the detailed and positive observations regarding the literature review, the presentation of data, and the inclusion of non-scientific evidence. We are pleased that the wide range of references and the structured approach to the data were well received. We especially appreciate the recognition of the balance between the benefits and challenges presented, as well as the appreciation of the integration of trends and practical experiences, which we believe enrich the discussion. We remain attentive to ensuring that non-scientific evidence complements the main findings in a solid and contextualized manner. We thank you for highlighting these points and are open to considering additional suggestions that could further improve the article. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **References and Literature Review**  **The article draws on a wide range of up-to-date and relevant references, including systematic reviews, international guidelines, and recent studies. The literature review is comprehensive, covering the evolution of e-Health and m-Health, their adoption in various countries, and their pedagogical implications. It also discusses the classification of health technologies and reviews the main types of educational tools and their impact on health teaching. The references are current and appropriate, supporting the article’s arguments and demonstrating thorough engagement with the field.** | We thank the reviewer for the thorough analysis and recognition of the quality of the literature review. We deeply value the observation regarding the breadth and timeliness of the references used, including international guidelines, systematic reviews, and recent studies. Our aim was precisely to build a solid theoretical foundation that reflects the complexity and evolution of digital health technologies, as well as their pedagogical implications in different global contexts. The reviewer's appreciation for the coherence between the cited sources and the arguments developed reinforces our commitment to scientific relevance and alignment with contemporary discussions in the field. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The writing is clear, well-organized, and accessible to both academic and professional audiences Technical terms are explained, and the narrative flows logically from background to conclusion. Occasional minor language inconsistencies do not impede understanding.** | **We thank the reviewer for the positive comments about the clarity and organization of the text. We will carefully review the manuscript to correct any linguistic inconsistencies and ensure greater uniformity in the writing.** |
| Optional/General comments Comentários opcionais/gerais | **Summary Table: Strengths and Areas for Improvement**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Section** | **Strengths** | **Areas for Improvement** | | Abstract &  Introduction | Clear, contextual, well-mapped | State research questions/objectives  explicitly | | Literature Review | Comprehensive, up-to-date, well- referenced | More critical synthesis, highlight evidence gaps | | Methods | Practical discussion of validation  methods | Detail literature search and selection  process | | Data/Results | Structured, use of tables/charts,  practical focus | Include more quantitative data,  compare | | Non-Scientific  Evidence | Contextual insights, real-world relevance | Distinguish clearly from empirical findings | | Writing Style | Clear, logical, accessible | Use more subheadings, tighten  language in places |   **Comments and Suggestions**  • The review could benefit from a more explicit description of its search and selection strategy for included studies, which would enhance transparency and reproducibility.  • While the article covers validation methodologies in depth, including a brief critique of common pitfalls or limitations in current validation practices would add value.  • The discussion could be strengthened by offering more concrete recommendations for educators or developers regarding the integration and validation of mobile apps in curricula.  • The inclusion of user perspectives (e.g., student or teacher feedback) from primary studies would further enrich the analysis.  **Overall Assessment**  This article provides a thorough and timely overview of the applicability and validation of educational technologies in health education, with a strong emphasis on mobile applications. It successfully synthesizes current evidence, highlights both opportunities and challenges, and offers practical insights into validation methods. With minor improvements in methodological transparency and practical recommendations, it would serve as an excellent resource for educators, developers, and policymakers interested in digital health education. | **We sincerely appreciate the detailed suggestions and the overall positive evaluation of the manuscript. We agree with the importance of making the research strategy more transparent and have rewritten the paragraphs referring to it with a view to improvement. We also appreciate the suggestion to include a brief critical analysis of the limitations of current validation practices, which are described in the lingo of the article. Finally, we will consider incorporating the perspectives of users of primary studies in order to enrich the analysis with practical experiences. These contributions are extremely valuable and have been incorporated into the revision of the text.** |
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