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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written and organised manuscript. The basis for the work is well described.

Methods

Major compulsory revisions

More detail is necessary within this section

Could the authors clarify if this study was a process evaluation conducted alongside the TELBIL trial and if so was any post-intervention intention measured? What were the start and end dates of the TELBIL trial and at what time point during the TELBIL trial was the TAM questionnaire administered to healthcare professionals?

Were only 58 patients involved in the actual TELBIL trial (and is this number overall or just the number of patients recruited to the intervention arm)? Can the authors provide detail about how many patients were eligible but declined to be part of the trial? Given the low number of patients recruited it seems unlikely that a majority of the healthcare professionals sent a questionnaire had had a patient that was part of the TELBIL trial.

Can the authors comment on the degree of patient uptake by health centre?

This was a predictive study - was a power calculation done? Was the analysis sufficiently powered given the low response rate?

Results

Major Compulsory revisions

Again more detail should be added here. What was the response rate by health centre for healthcare professionals - were some healthcare centres more represented than others? Was there any suggestion of clustering of responses?

The overall response rate is quite low and for paediatricians it was only 38% and for nurses only 40%. The sample appears to be heavily gender biased. It is unfortunate that there is no demographic data available for the non-responders since this greatly limits the generalisability of the study findings. The next paragraphs (descriptive statistics) also suggests a potential response bias for highly motivated practitioners.
1st paragraph
Was the Kruskal Wallis the appropriate test here - perhaps the paediatricians should be excluded from these analyses given the extremely small group number?

2nd paragraph
Were all respondents pooled based on the analysis presented in the 1st paragraph? Table 4 would benefit from inclusion of the overall R2 for each model.

3rd paragraph
do the authors mean "subjective norms" rather than "social norms (Minor essential revision)

Major compulsory revision
Fig 1 - can the authors clarify the model presented in this figure? The continuous arrows are suggested as significant relationships and the broken arrows as hypothesised relationships. Is this model suggesting that PU & PEU are mediated through "Facilitators", and that "compatibly" and "subjective norm" have a direct effect on IU? If so - why was this not the model tested? In the second logistic regression it seems that all variables were allowed to compete and that PU has had a direct influence on IU, rather than an indirect influence as suggested by the "extend" TAM model presented in Table 4. This needs clarification. It is also not clear as to why there is an hypothesised influence of subjective norm on IU.

Discussion

Major compulsory revisions
This study shows that the healthcare professionals who responded to the study questionnaire are highly motivated to adopt telemonitoring. Generalisation of the study findings beyond the study sample is greatly hampered by the lack of demographic data for non-respondents.

Major compulsory revisions
Limitations
The authors understate the limitations of this work. They describe the response rate of 44% as “acceptable” when it is actually quite low, especially when they cannot provide any information about the respondent group compares with the population sampled.

It is also a weakness of this study that no elicitation work was undertaken with the target population. As a minimum pilot work would have provided some face validity of the content of the questionnaire – there is no mention in the manuscript of any pilot work being undertaken. As the authors state it is possible that some very important beliefs were missed.

Conclusion
Given the lack of clarity in the model presented in Figure 1 it is not immediately apparent that the findings of this study support the extended TAM
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