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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper which provides recommendations for using text messages and replies for gathering patient information. The authors draw on their experience and lessons learned in six studies using text messaging for data acquisition.

Herein lies part of the problem. They only refer to their own work. There is no literature cited against which to compare their opinions. Of the seven references, six are to their own studies upon which the recommendations are based. Does the current literature support or refute each of their 15 recommendations?

There are several places in the paper where there should be references to support statements made, eg lines 67-68, 97, 173, 175, 176 and others.

Although presented in the IMRD format the paper has not aim and the methods are not presented in enough detail to be replicated.

The recommendations are presented in an anecdotal manner.

The section on The Phone has important information regarding technical difficulties and failure to resolve these. What were these difficulties? Why could they not be solved? Have others experienced the same problems? Have others managed to resolve them?

The discussion expands on their recommendation but lacks reference to other sources that support or contradict their point of view.
In effect the paper, as presented, is an opinion piece.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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