

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/mhealth-21-32>

Reviewer

General comments

This paper presents the use of value-based modeling to model a Mobile Health Application (a digital application software system). Please, take into account the major and minor comments listed follow.

Specific comments

Major comments

1. Keywords. The list of keywords must be improved. Please, consider to replace the keywords “value” and “modeling”, with the unique term “value-based modeling”. Please, consider to add the keywords “mobile”, “design science”, “convergence”, “PArchitect”.

Reply 1: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The suggested key words were added.

2. In Results section, you included details related to the model of the proposed digital application software system. What about the final development of the digital application software system (and not the model), using this model? Had been developed? If yes, could you add screenshots? If yes, could you explain too if the application has been validated in a real environment?

Reply 2: We have not yet developed a prototype digital application. We have submitted a grant proposal and are seeking others to secure funding for that.

Changes in the text: A sentence has been added to the end of the conclusions section to clarify this point and state the future work planned.

3. Original articles must have clinical impact. Please, could you add a paragraph in Discussion section to show the clinical impact that this work (and not next steps) had?

Reply 3: We have complied.

Changes in the text: A discussion of clinical impact was added to the discussion paragraph that begins: “The proposed healthcare app system...”

4. Please, a paragraph in “Discussion” section including next steps would be very useful to fully understand the final aim of the work.

Reply 4: We have complied.

Changes in the text: A sentence has been added to the end of the conclusions section to clarify this point and state the future work planned.

Minor comments

1. Author contributions, Manuscript writing. “All authors” is obligatory. More information in <https://mhealth.amegroups.com/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors>, section 3.4.

Reply 1: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The manuscript writing has been emended to include “all authors”.

2. Please, extends the abbreviation “IoT” the first time used in the paper. All abbreviations should be defined when they are first used in the text.

Reply 2: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The first instance of the term “internet of things” was given in full.

3. Methods section, paragraph #3. Please, consider to change “renumeration” to “remuneration”.

Reply 3: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The misspelling has been corrected.

4. Methods section, paragraph #8. Please, consider to add a reference related to the “proposal to the government of Saudi Arabia to develop a mobile application system for the improvement of access to health services”.

Reply 4: We have complied.

Changes in the text: A citation to the webpage for the proposal has been added to the reference section.

5. Discussion and/or Conclusions section, title. Please, consider to change “Discussion and/or Conclusions” to “Discussion and Conclusions”, “Discussion” or “Conclusions”.

Reply 5: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The section title has been changed to “Discussion”.

6. A statement should be included at the end of the “Introduction” to indicate which reporting checklist was followed (e.g., “We present the following article/case in accordance with the CONSORT reporting checklist.”). The manuscript should also include a Reporting Checklist statement in the footnote (see the “3.7 Footnote”). More information in

<https://mhealth.amegroups.com/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors>, section 2.1.1.

Reply 6: This paper reports development of a value-based model using PArchitect software. This was not an interventional study, and no data were generated, thus the paper was not written according to defined reporting guidelines.

Changes in the text: The above statement was added to the end of the introduction section.

7. Acknowledgments. If a part of the manuscript has been presented elsewhere (e.g. meeting presentation/poster history), a corresponding statement should be provided in the acknowledgment section. Maybe a related work had presented in SoutheastCon 2021 (<https://doi.org/10.1109/SoutheastCon45413.2021.9401857>). Please, if I'm right, include the corresponding statement in Acknowledgments.

Reply 7: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The acknowledgements section has been emended to add references to prior work presented at conferences and referred to in the present article.

8. Reference #1. If a reference has more than three authors, the first three authors should be listed followed by "et al."

Reply 8: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The citation in reference number one has been emended to reduce the number of listed authors to three followed by the term "et al."

9. Figures. Please, to improve the readability capability, consider to up the size of the text

included in the figures.

Reply 9: The figures presented are screen-grabs of the software system as it displays the results of modeling. It is often the case that font display is set by the software. However, where possible, the text in the models have been enlarged, and the size of the figures in the article have been increased to improve readability.

Changes in the text: The text within the figures, and the size of the figures, have been updated to improve readability.

10. You used “healthcare” and “health care”. Please, unify using only one of them.

Reply 10: We have complied.

Changes in the text: The term “healthcare” has been standardized in the text.
