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Reviewer's report:

De Vries and colleagues present in their manuscript results of a qualitative analysis after interviewing 16 PD patients. The aim of the interview was to explore PD patients’ opinion on home-based video recording used for movement analysis in the frame of research or clinical routine. The manuscript reports interesting and new data. I have some comments that may further help to make the structure and content of the MS clearer and potentially more balanced.

- Methods: The authors may present some more details about the selection and recruitment process of the 16 persons interviewed. Were all of them already involved in studies (with / without new assessment technology)? If yes, could the authors slightly downscale the value of their finding that all of the patients were willing to be videotaped? I assume that not all PD patients would accept such an assessment. Could the authors also mention that the high "acceptance rate" may be a geographical phenomenon / elaborate on additional potential reasons?

- Methods: The authors mention a "set-up" that may have already been in use, or at least produced. It would be helpful to get some more details about this system, and which information the patients got about this "specific" system during the interview. The authors may also mention relatively early in the methods section that the system would be able to adapt the video recordings (figure 1). I assume that this information was also provided to the interviewed persons.

- Methods: Could the authors explain the mechanism of "concept saturation" a bit in more detail? How did the research team make sure that the (obviously continuously performed during the collection of the interviews) process of reaching this saturation did not influence their questions / interview structure / selection of topics during new interviews?

- Results: How many "first level themes" were defined? If they were more than three, how did the authors define the 3 first level themes that are presented as the most relevant ones?

- Results: I agree entirely with the authors that home-based camera observation is an important topic, and I am also in favour of this method. However, my feeling is that the
authors present the data with a tendency towards "too positive". For example, the "interfering" paragraph reports that half of the participants wanted to see the data before the information goes to the doctor, and half don't. However, only a statement of a participant who did not want to interfere with the data is presented. I also suggest to present data in general with beginning with the most frequent opinion (e.g. privacy protection paragraph).

- Discussion: automatic analyses can be performed…. : Can the authors add a reference?

- Introduction, line 2: "the 20st century"; line 27: "fluctuate" instead of "fluctuations"; line 52/53: "symptoms" instead of "disorders"

- Results, last page first line: "turn off"

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

Yes

**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.

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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