



# Understanding User Perceptions of Personalized Feedback in Digital Health Tools

Oriana. Piskorz-Ryń<sup>1</sup>, Rafael. Ballester-Ripoll<sup>2\*</sup>, Daniela. Gottschlich<sup>3</sup>, Mehdi. Rostami<sup>4,5</sup>, Sefa. Bulut<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Caldas, Street 6623b-03, Manizales 170004, Caldas, Colombia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Personality, Assessment, and Psychological Treatments, University of Valencia, Spain

<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC, Canada

<sup>4</sup> Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

<sup>5</sup> Rehabilitation Department, York Rehab Clinic, Toronto, Canada

<sup>6</sup> Department of Counseling Psychology & Head of the Counseling Center, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey

\* Corresponding author email address: rafaelripoll@uv.es

---

Editor	Reviewers
Özgür Eken <sup>id</sup> Associate Professor, Inonu University, Malatya, Turkey ozgureken86@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Zahra Naghsh <sup>id</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: z.naghsh@ut.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Masoud Mirmoezi <sup>id</sup> Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The repeated use of passive constructions (e.g., “data were collected,” “interviews were conducted”) weakens narrative engagement. Rewriting in active voice where possible would improve readability and highlight researcher engagement (e.g., “We conducted 20 semi-structured interviews...”).

While the tables offer thorough coding structures, their presentation is overly text-heavy. Consider using figures or thematic maps (e.g., radial diagrams) to visualize the transition from open codes to core themes, making the data structure more accessible.

Paragraph: Introduction, sentence: “...feedback systems must be co-designed with end-users to ensure cultural, emotional, and functional fit...”

Terms like “judgmental,” “robotic,” and “supportive” are used frequently. Consider adding short user quotes to anchor these descriptions and differentiate between emotional valence (e.g., anger vs. guilt).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paper does not specify how theoretical saturation was determined. A brief explanation of criteria or an example would enhance transparency and methodological rigor.

Given the rich findings across four themes, a conceptual diagram summarizing the relationship between themes (e.g., personalization, emotional resonance, trust) could improve the paper's theoretical contribution and reader comprehension.

Trust, privacy, and emotional response are grouped into one theme, but they represent distinct psychological constructs. Consider separating trust and privacy into subthemes or justifying the combined analysis.

While NVivo 14 is referenced, there's no discussion of how software use improved coding accuracy or thematic saturation. Providing examples (e.g., word frequency matrices or co-occurrence mapping) would strengthen the justification.

The discussion highlights supportive findings but lacks acknowledgment of divergent responses or exceptions. Including counter-narratives (e.g., users who appreciated generic feedback) would reflect analytical balance.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.