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Reviewer's report:

Thanks and congratulations to the authors for going through the revision process and addressing most of the comments that were made. This is no small project for a lengthy paper such as this.

My comments now should be fairly easily addressed.

- I have not further comments on the first several pages. I will personally find the literature review very helpful for my own work!

- On page 18, just prior to "5. Stage III: User Study" I'm not clear about the meaning of that paragraph. You calculated a number of possible associations and found no significant results. The fact that one non-significant result is closer to significance than another is not relevant statistically -- they are all non-significant. I would recommend a simple statement (if any) stating that the tested associations were all non-significant.

- On that and the next page, I don't think spelling out the exact questions asked of the study participants is needed here. Perhaps another appendix? That section could be shorter, and all in a paragraph format.

- On page 20, you state that "Taken together, most of these apps were found to have poor usability according to their SUS scores." When the majority were either at or slightly below the 'acceptable' level, that term 'poor' seems inaccurate. "Poor to marginal" is a more accurate reading of the table.

- On that same page, I wanted to know more about how you determined that the SUS scores were inversely related to the number of problems. Was this just by looking at the chart, or did you use a statistical method in addition? If yes, was the relationship significant? I didn't see the same obvious association between the two data sources that you did, just from looking at the chart. This question is also relevant for the last paragraph of your 'Key findings' section.

- That key findings section could be shorter and more focused on summarizing the very most important findings.....also I don't know what 'picturized' on the second line, page 23 means!

- The "Implications" section is quite important and well summarized.

- The "Conclusions" section should not once again repeat the methods, but rather just conclude with 2-3 sentences (eg sentence 1, sentence 6, and then another one or two about the use of these
findings). "Limitations" comments should come earlier, perhaps at the end of the 'key findings' section, but not in the conclusion.

Finally there are still some English language edits that would be helpful. For example, 'disable people' should be 'disabled people.' A quick run-through by an editor would fix such problems easily.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**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