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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper demonstrates an important approach to evaluating internet delivered healthcare interventions, although the title could be more focused toward the results of the qualitative thematic analysis. Since only the themes related to information preferences were discussed perhaps the title could reflect this, understanding reactions to information on the internet delivered health intervention or something related to understanding user information preferences. Your section named "Dilemmas posed by user preferences for information contro" seems like a central or core theme that could be used for the title.

The background could benefit from more detailed explanation of theoretical modelling. In particular the use of this approach is not clear in the analysis section and is not mentioned until the conclusions, especially regarding use of hypotheses. It would be clearer if the method explained the use of working hypotheses before and after the data collection and how they changed, specifically before, between and after study 1 and 2. A table of the hypotheses would help explain the process and analysis used in the study. With grounded theory approaches, use of working hypotheses helps clarify the emergent theories. While the authors discuss that the data did not supporting full theory analysis, the use of working hypotheses was central to this evaluation and needs to be explicated. It is also not clear how the "reactions" were explicated from the data. I am left with wanting to know what the themes or categories are for the studies and a list of specific themes regarding reactions that are hinted to in the discussion and implications.

I do think this is an important paper that justs needs some clarification of the methods/ analysis of theoretical modelling and more examples- themes or categories to give evidence to the discussion, in particular working hypotheses.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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