**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Assessing Core, e-Learning, Clinical and Technology Readiness to Integrate Telemedicine at Public Health Facilities in Uganda: A Health Facility – Based Survey

**Version:** 0  **Date:** 10 Jul 2018

**Reviewer:** John Oldroyd

**Reviewer’s report:**

Assessing Core, e-Learning, Clinical and Technology Readiness to Integration of Telemedicine at Public Health Facilities in Uganda: A Health Facility - Based Survey

**Summary**

This paper addresses an important topic namely, the emerging use of telemedicine in low middle income countries, in this case Uganda. A cross sectional study was conducted with mixed methods: extraction of quantitative data on readiness to adopt telemedicine from doctors and other clinicians; focus group discussions with patients (n=7); survey data collection on readiness to change technological systems (n=406). There was a high level of awareness of telemedicine in health professionals, although fewer had used it. There was a lack of readiness for technological changes across health facilities of different size and complexity.

**Abstract**

This is well written.

I don't see a correlation coefficient to support the result that "A weak but positive correlation existed…."

**Introduction**

What does "according to literature prevalence:" on p4 mean? It is not clear.

What telemedicine is included in the Uganda context? Could some examples of telemedicine in these settings be given?

There is a good description of health care in Uganda which is helpful to the reader unfamiliar with this context (p4).

**Methods**
How was recruitment conducted for surveys and focus groups? More detail is needed.

No audio recording were made of the FGDs " Written notes were made of the discussions because participants had reservations about audio recording. " How was this compensated for? What rigour was there to ensure correct note taking and that nothing was missed?

Reference is made to 'unified theory' on page 13 in the discussion. Otherwise, there is no theoretical framework used. I think the project lends itself to a framework such as the health beliefs model or similar framework as the study is an investigation of people's awareness of telehealth willingness to change behaviours in relation to a health technology.

What is the technology assessment model page 14? It needs a reference. Is this a theoretical framework?

Was any attempt made at validating the surveys used?

Results

I don't see the 'themes' and subthemes arising from the FGDs referred to in the methods section.

Discussion

This is generally good. Very good reference to the literature is made. The authors do not stray from discussing the results of this study. However, other studies in LMIC need to be emphasized. A study in Mauritius (p14) is mentioned as a study in Lebanon (P15). Are they similar settings with similar infrastructure and resource challenges to Uganda?

There is no strengths and limitations section.

What future research should be undertaken in this field?

Conclusion

This is clear.
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