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This study aims to serve as the introduction of such a framework in the product development and evaluation of any health care technology.

The authors mentioned conducting a systematic review however, there are no citation to follow nor the results of the review are not discussed in the paper. (Page 5, line 17).

Participants who were involved in the study "had previously shown interest in the study, or had attended our launch event, were invited and encouraged to share the link with colleagues". There are study design concerns, first this is a convenience sample and participants had attended a lunch event which introduces bias to the findings.

Response rates to the survey are very low 33/152 (21%), and the sample size is too small. Males were underrepresented in this study.

The authors argue state: "we assume the dashboard is offered to 100, 500 and 1000 potential interested clients and the product". What is the assumption based on? Literature? It is unclear.

Table 7 is interesting. One inquiry is the extrapolations to 500 potential clients validated?

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

No

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

Yes

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