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Reviewer's report:

well written document of a telehealth service.
I have few concerns-
page 3 "telehealth useful for ambulatory care" is not entirely correct. many centres are using it for inpatient care as well
page 6-to make it easy to read, sub headings under patients and methods will be useful-clinic model, data collection, cost analysis etc rather than writing them continuously
page 9-figure 3 not needed, info is already in table 1,
page 11 lines 1-12 in discussion--I think content of this paragraph needs to be incorporated into clinic model in page 6.

page 14- line 12-15 what is the evidence that telehealth is not suitable for establishing rapport for new patients? A study from Townsville teleoncology network in your own state titled "Teleoncology replacing face to face care***" clearly shows you could establish rapport via telehealth.

cost analysis- this is not complete and only applicable to centres that have already established telehealth networks. So, we can't generalise to centres that are starting up. I'll mention this as a limitation in discussion.

Conclusion says--more studies are needed. this is misleading because COH has many examples of telehealth success and Queensland has many telehealth networks that are successful. I like to see something along these lines "since we have many examples at COH and reasonable evidence in the literature, telehealth needs to be incorporated as core business--(see recent MJA perspective)"
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