

## **Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** Telemedicine in clinical practice: a review of the literature

### **Authors:**

Aud Obstfelder ([aud.obstfelder@fagmed.uit.no](mailto:aud.obstfelder@fagmed.uit.no))

Kjersti H Engeseth ([kjersti.halvorsen.engeseth@telemed.no](mailto:kjersti.halvorsen.engeseth@telemed.no))

Rolf Wynn ([rolf.wynn@gmail.com](mailto:rolf.wynn@gmail.com))

**Version: 2 Date:** 20 May 2007

**Author's response to reviews:** see over

**MS: 1510848797123777**

**Characteristics of successfully implemented telemedical applications (Former title: Telemedicine in clinical practice: a review of the literature)**

**Aud Obstfelder, Kjersti H Engeseth and Rolf Wynn**

Dear Editor,

We are grateful for the valuable comments given by the Editorial Team and the Reviewers. We believe the revisions have improved our manuscript considerably.

Below, you will find a summary of the given comments and the subsequent changes made in the manuscript.

Regarding the comments from the Implementation Science Editorial Team:

1. The title of the article has been changed to more accurately reflect its content.
2. The question that the paper answers is now posed more clearly at the end of the Background section.
3. We have now better clarified our sampling procedure, and amended the text accordingly, cf. the revised Methods section.
4. The revised manuscript conforms to the journal style.
5. All files should now be correctly formatted.

Regarding the comments from Reviewer Carl May:

1. We see the point made by Reviewer May relating to a possible confusion when comparing the approaches used in the former version of the Results and Discussion sections. We have now edited the article in such a way that the procedure we have followed has become clearer. We believe our approach, i.e. the use of a qualitative approach drawing on principles from Grounded Theory in the analysis, followed by the use of STS theory in the discussion, has been fruitful. We have also added further comments on our choice of method in the Methods and Discussion sections.
2. The text in Boxes 1 and 2 has been made more detailed.
3. We have included the reference suggested by the reviewer, citing it in the Background and Discussion sections.

Regarding the comments from Reviewer Marie-Pierre Gagnon:

1. We have followed the advice of the Reviewer in better explaining the rationale for our choice of method. We agree with the Reviewer that it is an important argument for the choice of a qualitative method that much of the research that we discuss is qualitative.
2. We have taken into consideration the comments regarding the provision of sufficient details to assess the rigor of the search strategy, and changes in the text have been made accordingly:
  1. Details regarding the number of reviewers that assessed the selected studies have been included in the text.
  2. A description of the keyword validation process has been made.

3. The references and citations to the included studies have not been searched and a comment on this is made in the text.
4. The criteria by which we included studies grouped in the “Clinical use” category have been more clearly described in the Methods section.
5. The Appendix has been expanded somewhat by adding more details about the studies included (i.e. locations, participants, type of study).

3. Comments regarding the Results and Discussion sections:

1. The numeration of the common features has been revised, as suggested.
2. It is now mentioned explicitly in the text that categories number 1 and 2 and 5 and 6 are discussed together.
3. The Discussion section has been revised and improved (cf. also feedback to comments from Reviewer May).

4. Other comments

1. All references are now in numerical order.
2. The reference to Chau and Hu has been corrected.
3. A better description of the data saturation method has been given in the Methods section.
4. Figure 1 is now presented as a flow diagram describing the different steps of the literature review, as suggested.
5. Labels “Box 1” and “Box 2“ are now used instead of “Figure 2“ and “Figure 3”, as suggested by the Reviewer.
6. Regarding the quality of written English: The article has now been proof read and edited by a native English speaker.