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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have revised their manuscript considering the reviewers’ suggestions which has substantially contributed to the manuscript’s quality. There are only a few minor issues that should be addressed within a possible revision. I congratulate the authors for this well done review and hope that their proposed study will importantly add to the small body of evidence.

- Could you please address the issue of potential adverse events of telemedicine interventions as this an issue frequently dismissed by systematic reviews. Also, there should be a short notion if the included study assessed (and found) adverse events.
- On page 7 under Search Strategy, it should read “October 2011” not 2014
- Controlled-before-after study: I cannot access the included study and therefore, I might be wrong, but if participants were allocated to the two groups by the investigators, the study should be labelled as “non-randomised”.
- On page 11 (second paragraph) you refer to patients “who either did not heal or were lost to follow-up”. Is this correct or does this only refer to drop-outs (as these numbers are given for drop-outs in table 2).
- On page 12 at the end of the first paragraph it should be “study groups” instead of “intervention groups”.
- On page 13 (third paragraph) it should be “heart” (twice) instead of health.
- On page 14 (first paragraph) it should be “Table 7” not Table 5.
- The first sentence under CONCLUSION should start with “The systematic review…”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests