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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The paper actually addresses three issues: a framework based on OSGi (p 9 – 12), theoretical modelling (p12- 16) and the real world deployment (p 16-21). Given the title it would be preferable to reduce the first two components.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   No significant data are presented. The abstract and discussion talk about qualitative feedback but this is not presented.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Minimal quantitative data is presented in Fig 15.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The discussion and conclusions are tentative. The authors state that they do not have sufficient data to “provide meaningful results” p20.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   The data appears to come from 2 patients and 2 caregivers (p7). This should also be stated in “abstract-methods”. It appears to be somewhat hidden.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   The evidence base is appropriate.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The abstract should provide better focus

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Acceptable. There are a number of typos which should be corrected to improve any revision. The reference to Figures is out of sequence
Recommendation: Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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