

Article details: 2020-0041	
Title	Remote-only monitoring for patients with cardiac implantable electronic devices: a before and after pilot study
Authors	John A. Sapp BSc, Anne M. Gillis MD, Amir AbdelWahab MD MSc MBBCh, Isabelle Nault MD, Pablo B. Nery MD, Jeff S. Healey MD MSc, Satish R. Raj MD MSCI, Evan Lockwood, MD, Laurence D. Sterns MD, Samuel F. Sears PhD, George A. Wells PhD, Raymond Yee MD, François Philippon MD, Anthony Tang MD, Ratika Parkash MD MS
Reviewer 1	Dr. Clifton C. Addison
Institution	Jackson State University
General comments (author response in bold)	Authors did a good job in conducting the research and presenting the findings in a logical manner. We thank the reviewer for their comments.
Reviewer 2	Dr. Fady Hannah-Shmouni
Institution	National Institutes of Health, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
General comments (author response in bold)	This is a timely prospective observational pilot study (in light of COVID-19) for determining the feasibility and effectiveness of remote management of cardiac implantable devices in five centers across Canada: 176 patients enrolled, 100 were implanted with ICDs and 76 with pacemakers, with expected drop outs due to loss of f/u or death. The authors present long follow up data, which is a strength. Their main findings are: -reduction in health care utilization -safety -generalizable to all cardiac implantable devices -improved QoL Given the decreased uptake of remote care monitoring for cardiac devices due to several factors, including lack of reimbursement infrastructure from local and regional authorities, this study will help inform future decisions pertaining to resource allocation and physician reimbursements. Cost analysis was preliminary as outlined. The manuscript is well written. The limitations are outlined. The figures and tables are detailed and appropriate. We thank the reviewer for their comments.
Reviewer 3	Dr. Jeffrey A Bakal
Institution	University of Alberta, Canadian VIGOUR Centre
General comments (author response in bold)	Overall this is a straightforward analysis and is well presented. A few minor comments: 1) In the use of the composite you should be clear on whether you are using the first event, or worst event or ?? We are using the first event. This has been clarified. 2) The p-values should be rounded meaningfully p = 0.706 has the same interpretation as 0.7 This has been done.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <p>3) When presenting the costs in the cost efficacy there should be a CI included.
This has been added.</p> <p>4) Remove the "***"s from Figure 2.
These have been removed.</p> |
|--|--|