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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for re-submitting the manuscript and taking into account the suggested reviewer revisions. I agree that the manuscript is much improved. This represents is an interesting and very relevant piece of work.

Line 97 - 98: I understand that goal of this research is not to test a theory of behavior change; however, given that this research focuses on an intervention that is designed to change behavior, the way that the paper is framed implicitly draws on key constructs from several theories. For example, while not explicitly stated, in the discussion as to why eHealth may facilitate weight management, the authors discuss its merits in terms of increasing self-efficacy, supporting users to overcome perceived barriers, etc. These are all constructs of various theories of behavior change. I'm not sure that stating that "no pre-determined theoretical framework" is necessary, or even reflective, of how the paper is introduced. I suggest that the authors remove that sentence and simply be more explicit about how behavior change theory might explain why eHealth shows promise in the introduction and discussion. Several of these constructs also arise in the results - and including reference to such constructs may help underscore the findings and the conclusions drawn about overcoming barriers to weight management.

Line 173: Did the authors assess inter-rater reliability/agreement between coders? It would improve the rigor of the study to include additional information on this, if available.

Line 547: I think that the discussion of limitations is much improved in general. However, you state that the findings do not generalize well to the male population - thus, the wording implies that the findings are generalizable to the female population. Given such a small sample size and qualitative nature of the study, claims of generalizability do not seem justified. I suggest rephrasing this sentence.
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