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Methods: For phase I the authors reference a literature review and expert consult for their strategy selection, but I was unable to identify the process with which this review was finalized (whether the literature was predominantly high/low resource settings) and how the experts chose the highest priority barriers. The references 10, 11 which seem to allude to the final are from a single author (peer reviewed publication and dissertation) and the FLUXIM study (ref 9) seems to be the key sources for this information. I would recommend the authors define their processes more clearly and whether this framework is based principally on the FLUXIM trial's findings or how it was ensured the gaps (and therefore the resulting framework) was made more applicable to other high resource settings. I would also suggest the authors add more detail around the expert reviewer's feedback on their strategy and tools. Did the recommendations for improvement of the website come from patients or the expert reviewers?

Conclusions: It may be worthwhile highlighting in the discussion section previous attempts to address the issue in the Netherlands, why these did not work and what gaps this particular framework will fill that were not addressed by previous efforts. A feasibility study would be the next step but before a feasibility study in undertaken, is there feedback from and buy-in into this concept from professional associations?

Language: I would suggest some proofing and editing (though not major) to improve readability. However the paper needs to have a better flow. It was hard for me to track the process and assessment in the way the article is currently drafted.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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