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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is a small study but the subject is original and the background well described. The methods appear appropriate but there needs to be more clarity on some issues

1. The basis of purposive sampling was not entirely clear. I could not tell if the authors used the questionnaire just to identify people who had self initiated HBPM or whether the other variables were used in the purposive sampling. If so, they need to state what sort of sample they were aiming for.

2. There was no real justification of the sample size - although it is probably adequate for such a focussed study, it still needs to be justified. The researchers described iterative analysis and data collection, it was not clear how this affected what they did and the sample size – did they do the interviews first and use that to inform the subject guides for the focus groups, or was it the other way round? Did they reach data saturation?

3. The results are clearly presented. However, not all the issues picked up in the discussion are presented in the results. In particular there is discussion about the non-involvement of patients’ doctors with the home monitoring which is not clearly presented in the results.

4. The methods section describes the grounded theory approach and how themes are linked to develop an overriding theory. However, there is no mention of any emergent theory in the rest of the paper and the analysis presented is essentially thematic. This is fine for this type of study but it should be clear that a thematic analysis is being presented. If the authors have gone further in theory development, or used an existing theory to frame their final analysis, this should either described or it should be stated if the detailed publication is to be elsewhere.

Minor Essential Revisions

5. There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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