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Author's response to reviews:

Revisions to MS 1841870855587309 "Developing an online learning community for mental health professionals and service users: a discourse analysis". Janet Smithson, Ray Jones and Emily Ashurst

Formatting revisions

We have added a statement on the ethics approval, including the name and reference number for the approving body.

We have added an Acknowledgements section before the Reference section.

Boxes. We have taken out the boxes and put this information in the manuscript text.

Tables. We have changed the table format and citation.

Content revisions

Abstract: we have revised the conclusions, taken out the word "goal".

Background.

We have taken out the 23 seconds, though I think it was accurate, as the point is not necessary to the argument.

Referencing the authors' work: since submitting this article the status of some our other recent papers has changed, so we have taken out 3 articles not currently in press or published, and updated two from "in press" to the exact published references now available.

"The authors argue that service users are usually more experienced than professionals. This assertion surprised me somewhat, and I think it would be good to back this up with a citation if possible"
We have reworded this sentence and added a citation, we are talking here about experience of using the Internet, not wider medical experience.

The last paragraph of the background has been restated to make the research questions more clearly stated. The results and discussion have been revised to be more closely related to these research questions.

"The need for healthcare professionals to understand these technologies is vital"

P3, seems like a randomly placed sentence amongst the information about how patients come by health information.

We have changed this sentence.

There is considerable discourse/conversation literature on doctor patient communication and asymmetry etc available that you haven’t really looked at here. While I am not suggesting you get distracted from your general argument it might be useful to look at people like Maynard, Heath, Heritage and so forth, and in relation to the use of video. This will then help you think about how online communication is different

We did refer to Maynard, Heritage and others in this field, but rather too briefly, we have expanded this now.

The details of the MHPs' professions were in a table in the appendix, but we have taken out the table and answered this (briefly) in the main text now.

We have expanded our description of the DA/CA methods employed, and clarified the roles of the authors/moderators.

We have added details of the ethical approval, and about the informed participant consent.

Results

"In the first paragraph of the results the authors assert that they provided a 'non-hierarchical space' for MHPs and MHSUs, and yet it seems that both groups asserted their relative hierarchical positions rather quickly. I would like to see more explanation about this in the text, and reflecting on the way in which this may have been a goal that wasn't achieved, or if it was, to say more about it."

We have revised this first paragraph and also added more about this in the first paragraph of the Discussion section.

The sentences about moderators aiming for neutrality have been reworded, and a couple of references highlighting the impossibility of moderators actually being neutral have been added.
The moderators were not MH professionals - this has been stated explicitly now. It has also been stated more clearly that the analysis in this article was mainly done by the 1st author, who was not one of the moderators.

"As the methods of analysis have not been described in detail, the reader is unclear as to how the subheadings or 'themes' in the results have been identified."

This has been clarified in the methods section now.

We have reorganised the final sections, adding sections on Limitations, Directions for Future Research, and Conclusions, to make the findings, limitations and implications clearer.

Most of the 3 reviewers' comments have been addressed above, but here are responses to a few specific comments:

Triangulation with other methods. We have details of user feedback questionnaires in another article currently being submitted, which we could link to if that article is accepted before this article is published.

We agree that including MHSUs as moderators would be beneficial, this was one of the conclusions of the analysis, but this has been made clearer now. (we did include MHSUs in a related study where there were resources to pay them, the importance of lived experience moderators is being explored in another article currently being written).