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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editorial Team,

We have the pleasure in resubmitting a revised manuscript addressing the editorial comments. We would like to thank the editorial team for the thoughtful and valid comments on our manuscript. Please find the specific comments and responses below.

1) I wonder if title should be revised, to make it more concise.

E.g. "Availability and performance of image/video-based vital signs monitoring methods: A systematic review protocol"

Thank you for the suggestion - this more concise title has been used. The reason for listing the vital signs of interest separately was to not give the impression that all vital signs are included - for example, we have excluded temperature measurements. However, we have incorporated this in the abstract instead.

2) page 8, Outcome

- Do not agree to mention the aim of study under the heading of "Outcome" but the authors should provide a list of outcomes.

E.g. performance of new technology, ....
do not agree to present the following sentence under the heading of "Outcome"; A secondary aim will be to assess the quality of the studies’ methodology with respect to Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS).

But the authors should state the outcomes of interest.

Thank you for this suggestion - this has been modified in the text.

3) Page12, line 35, "A secondary intended outcome is an appraisal of the quality of reporting among the method ....", i think the authors should define the outcomes to be reported, and its measurements.

(e.g. quality of reporting under methods (high quality if all items are +, low quality if at least 2 items are -, ...)

Thank you for the suggestion. This has been modified in the text and the measurements have been incorporated into the "Assessment of Study Quality" section.

4) page15, line 44, "Finally, the GRADE methodology will be used to systematically rate the strength of the overall review as high/moderate/low/very low [16]" and Reference in page 22.

- need to revise reference (it is GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence., not GRADE guideline:2)

Thank you. This has been corrected.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our revised manuscript.

Dr Mirae Harford

Corresponding author