

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-22-45>

Reviewer A

The author affiliation at Semmelweis University is wrong, as there is no department of Behavioral Sciences there. The review lists only 5 references, the material reviewed does not come from credible sources and followed an accepted methodology.

Reply: I confirm that my affiliation is appropriate, here is the department's website: <https://semmelweis.hu/magtud/en/>

We mentioned in the paper that the role large technology companies play in healthcare has not been extensively analyzed in the literature, hence the number of references. However, we added more relevant references in the revised manuscript and included all relevant references of each collaboration as Supplementary Material.

Regarding methodology, we described in detail how we analyzed the collaborations between technology companies and healthcare institutions. There are no credible databases or peer-reviewed sources for performing such analyses. That's why we mention that this is the first review in the literature on the subject.

However, every single announcement with the relevant weblink is included in the Supplementary Material.

Changes in the text: New references.

Reviewer B

Important effort to characterize current relationships between technology companies and healthcare institutions. Overall, it is an okay/average consolidation of available information re: collaborations between technology and healthcare institutions but does not add much rich discussion around the implications or suggestions for the future, specifically around privacy. I would expect this paper to significantly increase its discussion of historical context, current day context, and implications regarding their expressed focus of privacy implications.

The results section reads in a piecemeal manner and would benefit from organization under themes so reader could better follow authors' point/thesis.

Reply: Thank you for the comment! We tried to improve the structure of the Results section with sub-sections around themes.

Changes in the text: 3 sub-section titles in Results.

Other recommendations:

(1) Would recommend that authors be precise about their language - i.e. what is a "technology giant" - how is that defined and why focus only on giants vs. other smaller technology companies? / how did they decide who to include as a "technology giant" and a "healthcare institution"? , would be specific about this so readers know what they are reading about.

Reply: Thank you for the recommendation! We defined what technology companies we looked at and what constituted a healthcare institution.

Changes in the text: We considered including technology companies with a revenue in 2022 over 1 billion USD with any prior examples of digital health collaborations in healthcare. Regarding healthcare institutions, we considered including one that involved a collaboration with a technology company while also having access to patient data.

(2) Technology innovation/changes has been a part of medicine for many decades and has a rich history. I would recommend the authors contextualize their paper more richly with discussion of history/social context/policy context, etc. Joel Howell is a scholar of technology in medicine, but there are likely other scholars that focus on privacy.

Reply: We added more discussions around privacy with papers and studies on the subject.

Changes in the text: Even though there were discussions about the role of devices and technology in general from the 1990s(1), healthcare in the 21st century has become more dependent on technologies than ever before(2).

From the early 21st century, discussions around privacy issues of the products and services of such technology companies have been in the spotlight(5).

(3) If focus of paper is privacy consequences - need to include richer discussion of this issue, including recent privacy breaches. Perhaps the author could summarize in more detail the implications for different stakeholders in this eco-system (i.e. the patient, the community, the technology corporations, the healthcare corporations).

Reply: We expanded the Discussion section around privacy and potential recommendations about regulating big technology companies' healthcare efforts.

Changes in the text: With new regulations such as the European GDPR, policy makers have been trying to protect the privacy of patients, as the consumers of healthcare technologies, success is limited knowing how slowly policies, regulations and general rules can follow the rate at which advanced technologies develop and become accessible(8).

Researchers and policy makers have been raising awareness about the importance of privacy in the digital age, especially when it comes to medical and healthcare technologies, however, progress is understandably slow(9)(10).