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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? 43 studies referenced not 44 in initial info in
   In Abstract 19 + 2 + 4+ 1+ 5 + 10 + 2 = 43 ), “staff follow-up and medication adherence” (n=19), “staff training, support and motivation” (n=2), “staff evaluation, monitoring and guidelines compliance” (n=4), “drug supply-chain and stock management” (n=2), “patient education and awareness” (n=1), “disease surveillance and intervention monitoring” (n=5), “data collection/transfer and reporting” (n=10) and “overview of mHealth projects” (n=2).
3. Are the data sound? Appear to be sound from the information presented and from references. providing that the numbers are corrected..
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes though there could be further critique of the rationale behind the weaknesses and strengths and the implications of this for further study.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes, a significant limitation will be using only peer reviewed papers given the amount of work ongoing that isn’t being charted, but this is necessary for the nature of the review.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes as far as I can judge.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes though more analysis on the things that don’t work would add to the paper.
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Some typos and gaps in sentences that destroy the flow, words left out etc. eg the utilization mHealth technologies in healthcare [6].
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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