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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and important discussion article.

Some of the arguments are not fully formed. I found that the important section on patient safety and ethical concerns regarding self-monitoring devices provided little direct relationship to the ethical concerns. I would like to see these emphasised more clearly as this is essentially the original section of the paper as the safety of self-monitoring devices has been investigated widely in the research literature.

The conclusions are not well related back to the discussion and whilst I do not dispute them I would prefer to see a clear link back to the discussion in the paper.

There are a few small questions I have:

P2 L48 you refer to the 'profession's basic ethical tenet' but you are not referring to a single profession and I suggest change to 'healthcare's basic ethical tenet' instead.

P4 L115 you use HCP without previously identifying the acronym and do not use again so I suggest spell in full

P5 L144 spelling mistake 'twenty-five'

P5 L161 please clarify you distinction between patient and consumer. the use of patient could be disputed throughout the paper but the sudden introduction of consumer here is potentially problematic.

Finally please ensure that you are always referring to multiple patients or clinicians when using apostrophes. At times this could be challenged as it could be single patients or clinicians.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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:
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