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Dear Editor of BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making,

I hereby submit a second revised version of the manuscript named “Attitudes among Healthcare Professionals towards ICT and Home Follow-up in Chronic Heart Failure Care” for publication in BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making.

The comments from the remaining reviewer, as well as from the editor, have been taken into consideration. This resulted in a few changes being done to the manuscript.

I present our changes (□) in context of the comments from the reviewer (☐) below:

☐ You talk about confidence and then switch straight to cost.
   We agree that this was a very bad transition in the text. This question was asked in the same section as the questions on attitudes toward and confidence in ICT in healthcare, and it did not fit better in any other section. Therefore we added the following sentence before the paragraph on cost and time usage. “Besides attitudes towards and confidence in ICT in healthcare, questions regarding cost and time were also covered in this section.”

☐ You equate use of computers with interest
   We have added the sentence “Computer usage at home could indicate an ICT interest as they choose to use computers outside their work.” This should hopefully clarify for the reader how we come to that conclusion. Also, note that we see this as an indication and not a hard fact.

☐ You seem to present a graph about possibilities and report on experiences in the text.
   The graph on possibilities belong to the text below the figure, which is how we have presented figures and text throughout the manuscript. For clarification we changed the text below the graph to start with “Figure 4”.

   We also added the following sentence before the first paragraph in that section. “Before asking about the attitudes toward distance monitoring and home follow-up of patients, it could be of interest to know how many who have experience in the matter.” This text might not really belong in the results part of the manuscript. However, since the reviewer did not find it clear enough we added this to make the text flow better.
Response to comments from the editor:

- According to Swedish laws and regulations an ethical approval is not necessary for this sort of research. We have consulted authorities to ensure this.

- Before the last submission, the manuscript was reviewed by a native English (British) speaking person with a PhD in technology. We do not consider another language review necessary, however if the editor disagrees we will of course revise the manuscript again.

- We have done our best to ensure that our manuscript follows your journal style. If it does not, please let us know what we can correct.

If you have any questions or comments you are very welcome to contact me at any time. Please note the change in contact e-mail and telephone number. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,
Anna Gund
PhD, eHealth

Dept. of Signals and Systems
Chalmers University of Technology
412 96 Gothenburg
Sweden

Phone: +47 407 60 581
Fax: +46 31 772 1782
E-mail: anna.gund@gmail.com