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Reviewer's report:

This paper needs "major Compulsory Revisions", and I have organized my comments according to the questions guiding a review

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The paper state four aims (p. 4), and it would be important to focus in somewhat more to fully appreciate the contribution. The
The use of “eHealth tools for patient follow-up” and “ICT-support in health care” should be more consistent, and stating the focus more clearly to be “CHF” from the beginning of the manuscript would also help.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
This paper reports on findings from a survey, where the authors have collected data from a strategic sample. Further clarification and explanation of how descriptive statistics and (too) many graphs make a qualitative study is absolutely needed before the paper can be evaluated.

3. Are the data sound?
The data are self reports, but because of the low response rate and uncertainty of who (which institutions) and why the specific respondents were selected makes it difficult to evaluate how sound the data are. Tighter alignment with studies on the same topic could help.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
It would be helpful with a more extensive review of the literature, fewer graphs, and more overview tables to help the reader to understand and appreciate this reported work.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The paper presents a lot of empirical material, but unfortunately all the aspects are not picked up in the discussion. The authors should also include more

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Only partly, it is a problem that sampling strategy, response rate and potential bias in the answers is only presented as part of the discussion.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Actually, I miss reference to newer work on tele-monitoring, CHF care etc. In addition, stating more explicitly what the paper adds to the body of accumulated studies would strengthen the contribution

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
When reading the draft, it is implicit until page 4 and aim that this is about CHF patients and providers’ attitudes to use of ICT to monitor or interact with these patients. Also pointing out explicitly implications of attitudes among professionals related to CHF care and treatment would improve clarity

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The paper would benefit from a through proof reading; in terms of simplification of long, complicated sentences where the message becomes blurred and the meaning hard to get. The findings are presented “mechanically”, repeating the graphs but little abstraction or summary as would be expected if this is a qualitatively oriented report.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interest.