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Reviewer’s report:

This is paper describes a protocol to qualitatively synthesize results from the development and evaluation of four web-based supportive interventions for children and adults with long-term illness. While the authors have provided detailed information regarding the four principles/dimensions that presumably will guide their evaluation of these four case studies, there is insufficient detail regarding the methodology for integrating the findings and how the meta-analytic approach further advances our understanding of how to develop better person-centered web-based supportive interventions beyond what we already know from individual studies. It seems that the authors have a great opportunity to experiment across the 4 case studies by testing different approaches and/or theories to guide the design, usability evaluation, implementation, and outcome evaluation of these interventions to see which approach is best suited at each phase. If the authors are indeed proposing this, the way the methods section is written does not convey this approach. Other specific comments are below:

Major Comments

“Use of people’s experiences”—please elaborate further on how the approach to understanding this differs from previous approaches of iterative participatory design

“Role of theories”: Will the 4 case studies use different theories to guide the design of the intervention? How will one test the efficacy of one set of theories versus another? re: utility?

“Evaluation of the effects”: It’s not clear how the authors propose to leverage the 4 case studies for this purpose. Will the same set of outcomes (health, well-being, quality of life, anxiety and depression, coping, self-efficacy, self-management, and knowledge about the long-term illness) be measured across the four studies? Seems like this would be possible with case studies 2-4 but not with case study #1.

“Development of a person-centered model for web support”: It’s not clear how this theme is different from “use of peoples’ experiences” or the “role of theories” in developing the intervention. Are the authors proposing that all four interventions will be developed from a similar platform using the same iterative participatory design process?

Please provide more information under the processing and analysis section. It’s
not clear what the authors plan to do for the “within-case and across case analyses”. Will standardized instruments or structured interview questions be used to elicit these responses from participants for comparisons across the 4 case studies?

Usability instruments are typically designed to be specific to the application itself. Is the intent to create fairly uniform features/functionalities and user interface across the four case studies that one usability instrument can be used?
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