

Opposition

My overall impression of Kanniga's master thesis is that it is well-written and thorough, and it offers valuable insight into what I've now been convinced – all thanks to reading – is a highly relevant topic.

The title and the abstract awaken interest to continue reading. The table of contents alongside the page numbering appear accurate except for the fact that the list of tables and list of figures were not included while the list of abbreviations was. As for the references and attachments, they look properly formatted according to the Harvard style as well. All references feel relevant to the topic.

In this brief opposition report, I've analyzed and discussed each section in the same order as in the thesis. In addition to that, I have left comments in the PDF file as well. Furthermore, I have included a handful of general suggestions that concerns the overall thesis below:

- I'd recommend running the thesis through the free application called *Grammarly* (it can be downloaded as a plug-in either for the browser or Microsoft Word) as there are a few spelling and grammatical errors throughout the text.
- I'd recommend looking over the various tenses as well. For the sake of readability, it would be easier to write in a single tense rather than mixing present tense and past tense; the latter would be preferable as the research (both the literature search and in your own work) has already been conducted.
- Similarly, I'd recommend reading the text aloud (or use the text to speech function in Microsoft Word) to catch any missing words or oddly structured sentences. While it is fully possible to understand the text as it is, there are certain spots where it becomes confusing and a clearer language would enhance the reading experience. Additionally, please mind certain word choices, e.g., app vs. application.
- I'd recommend looking over your reference program as certain citations are written as *et. al.* when it should be (from my understanding) *et al.* – no period is needed after the *et.*
- I'd recommend being more extensive with the references. As you will see in the PDF file, there are several spots where I think references are needed to back up your claims.

Introduction

The introduction is short and concise – it gives the reader a good introduction to what telemedicine is, the benefits, and how it can be used to support patients with various health conditions. Furthermore, the introduction makes the reader begin to understand the difference between self-monitoring and automated self-monitoring, and that in turn makes it easier to understand the motivation behind the research. The research question is easy to understand and encapsulates the topic that has been presented well.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- I'd recommend potentially extending the introduction so that it not only concerns patients who are suffering from chronic diseases or are elderly. In the limitations you make it clear that it does not focus on either gender or health condition, but the introduction and problem background are both (from my impression) focused on the elderly and/or with chronic diseases. The section would be nuanced in a better way if you could explain how automated self-monitoring would appeal to a younger population of users.

- I'd recommend potentially expanding on what risks there are with automated self-monitoring as it currently only highlights the benefits.
- I'd recommend defining what *benefits* and *risks* mean in the research question, and for who the benefits and risks would befall.

Seminar questions

- In your research question, you say that you want to discover what risks and benefits there are with automated self-monitoring, but in your introduction, there is a lot about its benefits. What can you tell me about the risks?
- Furthermore, in the limitations, you have said that the study does not focus on a specific health condition or gender, but much of what you had written in the introduction concerned the elderly and those with chronic illnesses, why is that?
 - o Is there a reason why you didn't include how a younger population of users?

Related Research

The related research section is extensive and provides a lot of valuable information concerning related studies. The four themes that are presented feel relevant, but how the themes were derived awakens questions. While how the themes came to be are still in question, the overall information feels synthesized and reads well as it sheds light on both healthcare professionals' perspectives on how patients use technology, how new technology would change the workflow, and how the professionals themselves perceive digital healthcare applications. Lastly, it gives a good summary of the two theories utilized in previous research.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- I'd recommend expanding on how the articles were analyzed, specifically on how the four themes came to be. Was the process inductive or deductive?
- You mention a literature review in the first paragraph in section 2, I'd recommend clarifying that as any reader who hasn't been in the same class will understand that it is a reference to a past course – if I've understood everything correctly.
- While it is currently situated in the method section (specifically in sections 3.1 and 3.2.1.), I'd recommend moving everything concerning the search practice to the very beginning of section 2. However, as I've understood you haven't conducted a proper literature review as the screening of the articles hasn't been properly addressed, therefore you do not have to include the search terms or search strategies.

Seminar questions

- You refer to a literature review in your thesis, but in my opinion, you haven't been as thorough and transparent as a literature review normally requires, so my question is: what literature review are you referring to?
- In the related research section of your thesis, you say that four themes have been presented. How did you develop these themes?

Method

The method section is overall good and while many of the puzzle pieces are there, the information feels somewhat shuffled. I understand it is hard to describe a workflow where many of the stages may have happened parallel to each other, but I think simply rearranging some of the subsections would make everything clearer.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- As aforementioned, move section 3.2 and its subsection to section 2 as it does not concern the method in my honest opinion.
- I'd recommend developing section 3.3, especially *why* the prototype was developed and if it was ever considered using a pre-existing application instead.
- I'd recommend developing the quality criteria section as it does not state what the study has done to fulfill these criteria. Furthermore, the section would be better off in the discussion section of the thesis when the reader has read everything and can settle on an opinion then.
- For similar reasons, I'd recommend developing the ethical consideration section as it does not explicitly state what the study has done to ensure the well-being of the participants. I know consent has been mentioned in the interview guide in the attachment, but it needs to be addressed in the text as well, preferably somewhere under section 3.4.
- I'd recommend adding a table of descriptive data concerning the recording length and the transcription length of each participant, or if you add two columns to table 2 in section 3.6.
- I'd recommend adding a new subsection and name it *thematic analysis* or similar where you actively show how the coding of the transcriptions happened.

Seminar questions

- You did this mock-up to be shown in the interviews, but did you ever consider using a pre-existing application?
 - o What would you say was your main motivation for creating the mock-up?
- How were the participants recruited?
- Why was snowball sampling chosen as a method of selection?
- In the result section, you write that a thematic coding took place. However, I would've wanted to read about that in the method chapter. Can you please explain how the transcriptions were analyzed?
- I found the ethics chapter somewhat thin in terms of how the participants had been informed about their rights, would you please tell me what ethical considerations were made?

Result

The result is presented in a structured manner with clear headings and plenty of quotes that show transparency. The themes presented feel relevant in relation to section 2, and overall the data feels thoroughly processed.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- I'd recommend using neutral pronouns when referring to the respondents, e.g., instead of he/him and she/her, it's fully possible to protect the participants' identity further by using they/them.
- I'd recommend looking into ways of potentially shortening the quotes as some are extremely long, (especially in section 4.2 with respondent 9's quote). I understand why you have included the quotes, and I absolutely think they should be there, but maybe there's a better way to utilize them than putting them in a table.

Seminar questions

- Certain quotes are somewhat long in the result section, have you looked into alternate ways of presenting the information?

Analysis and Discussion

The analysis and discussion section has a good connection with the related research section, and the result feels properly synthesized with previous research. However, the only thing missing is the theories that were mentioned in section 2, and I think discussing how they could be applied would benefit the discussion.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- If you decide to move the section concerning quality criteria, you should expand it here by also discussing if you reached some kind of saturation when you processed the interview data.
- I'd recommend discussing the theories here that were presented in section 2, or remove them entirely.

Seminar questions

- In the related research work you present two theories, how are you planning to use them?
- Did you feel like you reached saturation with the respondents' replies?

Conclusion/Attachments

The conclusion is short and precise, and serves as a good ending to the thesis. However, the information again feels somewhat shuffled as the *future research* section should be discussed in the previous section.

My suggestions for improvement are the following:

- I'd recommend moving the section concerning future research to the discussion.
- I'd recommend answering the research question explicitly.
- I'd recommend looking over the language, are challenges = barriers = risks?
- I'd recommend moving attachment 2 and use it in the text when you're describing the mock-up in the method section.

Seminar questions

- If you had to answer in a couple of sentences, what is the answer to the research question?

Final notes

You should be proud of this thesis – it is evident that you have worked hard, and your dedication truly shows. What I have pointed out in this report and in the comments attached to the PDF are merely suggestions to enhance the flow and readability.

Thank you for an interesting and well-written report, I wish you good luck!