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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript titled 'Usefulness and engagement with a guided workbook intervention (WorkPlan) to support work related goals among cancer survivors' aims to investigate work-related outcome of a workbook intervention in cancer survivors. This qualitative study presents patients' perceived effectiveness and potential improvement of the intervention program. This manuscript provides useful data for clinical practice; however, there are several issues in the manuscript.

Major comments:

1. Please indicate how the team selected participants. Was it purely sequential as described in the Methods? If the research team used another approach, please discuss bias of the results. Patients who had positive experience may participated in this study.

2. Could you clearly describe who were involved in data analysis (P6, data were analysed by LS and MA; P7, a second researcher analysed six transcripts). If most data were analysed by one researcher (LS?), please indicate it.

3. The interview also focused on compliance with the intervention as described in Methods. It is an important factor that potentially affects effectiveness (and perceived effectiveness) of this self-guided workbook. The participants did not mention their compliance in the interviews? If you have any data about compliance, please analyse or include in Results section and discuss the point.

4. Also, please indicate whether the intervention included telephone support calls (Woods et al., 2016 JMIR Res Protoc). If it was included, didn't they affect its perceived effectiveness and compliance? If telephone support was provided, revision of the conclusion may be needed.

5. The authors appropriately mentioned possible limitation of the study (sex and cancer types). Please shortly discuss potential bias of the results (2-3 sentences).
Minor comments:

Abstract
6. Please avoid unusual abbreviation in Abstract section (RTW).

Methods
7. Including basic information for the workbook (essential components) would help readers understand the results even if the authors have described details in a previous paper (Woods et al., JMIR Res Protoc 2016).

Results
8. Please explain the meaning of the numbers (shown in the end of participant's statement).

Discussion
9. The second sentence in Discussion include the words which seems somewhat informal tone (a journey from…). I recommend revising this using more formal language.
10. Some sentences in Conclusion section (L518-526) does not reflect main results of the current study. These sentences should be moved to Discussion section.

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.

Unable to assess

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

No
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:
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