

Review of: "Applying User-Centered Design Methods to Improve The Experience of the NHS APP"

Viktoriia Shubina

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses a relevant and timely problem: analyzing the usability of an NHS App. The motivation for the study is explained in great detail, which is a great asset to this manuscript.

I have provided comments below that, if considered, could enhance the overall quality of the study and provide greater clarity to the reader.

- Q1 and Q2: Are those your research questions? There is no description in the first mention as of now.
- Q3 appears in the text sporadically as well. They should appear in the text altogether to contribute to your research methodology, or the purpose should be better explained to the reader.

The theoretical background appears to be a mismatch with the actual study; please revisit it to make it coherent. Also, the title doesn't represent the read; the primary emphasis is usability, whereas you mention experience. It might confuse the reader, while, as I understood, you try to make a clear distinction from user experience. There is no need for the graphs or information you haven't used.

- The discussion of findings needs more information, such as the actual usability analysis (e.g., the time before the users achieved the goal, etc.).
- Considering the sample size of 15 participants in the study, do you believe it is sufficient for drawing reliable and statistically significant conclusions? If not, what sample size would you recommend based on the study's objectives and statistical considerations? A discussion is needed before the discussion session.
- Minor spellcheck is required (e.g., "He also points out Another .." A is capitalized in the middle of a sentence).