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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to comment on this manuscript. The processes associated with the development of high quality resources is an under reported and requires investigation to ensure that the best quality materials are produced for their intended audiences. I would like to raise some general points for the investigators to consider as well as some more specific issues.

General points for clarification and revision

1. This paper seems to suggest that the provision of information in a website could be regarded as an educational or knowledge intervention yet the actual references provided to support this do not relate a website but more active forms of online intervention. It is more appropriately, as the title suggests, a report of the development process. I think the authors should clarify their position with respect to the developing online health information as opposed to the use of online platforms to deliver educational interventions or other forms of online interventions. This is also important given the search strategy focused on education as a key search variable not "online information". This point is also raised in the discussion. So please clarify what is meant by evidence based resources as opposed to other resources. I note that the study in Reference 12 was not about the development on an evidence based online resource.

2. Could the authors please clarify whether any review was undertaken of the evidence to inform the design, development and formative evaluation of online health information. How were these issues dealt with in the VRG?

3. Given the importance of the systematic reviews in establishing the information needs of family carers, how did the research team ensure that the reviews did not exclude, and preferably deliberately sought to include, the views and perspective of all types of family carers across the community. It is important that the voices of carers from specific needs groups such as LGTBI, CALD, rural and remote etc are included in the development of resources for the whole of population. Could the authors please include a statement around this issue.
4. Given the importance of the VRG to the developmental process could the authors please provide details on the number, composition and expertise/perspective or constituency of the VRG members. This will provide the reader with confidence that the opinions of the intended end-users were appropriately included in the development process.

5. For those involved in the development of resources it would be useful to have the authors include some critical reflections on the developmental process - What worked? What was difficult? Whether the process was sufficient to ensure the integrity, not just of the content, but of the process for the communication of the content via a website.

Specific Issues for consideration.

6. Could the authors please advise on how decisions were made about layout and design of webpages.

7. Could the authors please advise as to how readability of content and eHealth literacy issues were considered by the VRG and tested.

8. Was a quality appraisal assessment undertaken to determine which external resources could be included in the website.

8. Was formal usability assessment, i.e. of navigation and functional decisions, conducted prior to the release of the website.

9. In the Results section, you provide numbers of visits from launch in May 2017, please provide an actual "date to" as the reader has no sense of how long the time has been. Is this number more or less than you anticipated and did you have any basis for predicting a visit rate.

10. You note that downloadable factsheets are available. What is their relationship to the Systematic Review content and/or web pages.

I appreciate that this may be more detail than the authors are able to currently provide but translation of evidence requires not only consideration of the quality of the evidence forming the basis for the content but the quality of the process for communication. Once again I congratulate the authors on following a process and being willing to share their findings.

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

Yes
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.

Yes

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:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal