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Reviewer's report:

This new version of the manuscript substantially addressed some of the points raised in my previous comments, better explaining the authors objectives, methods and accurately describing the different interventions considered in this review. The modifications have improved the overall quality of the manuscript. I still miss a more synthetic discussion section but this is understandable from the point of view of the difficulty analyzing the effect of so diverse and differently aimed interventions. In this line, I found the results of the first objective very useful and appropriate. However, I still believe that the second objective of the review is at this point a very difficult task given the diverse and scarce scientific literature available. In this regard, it might be a good idea to focus the attention of this paper on the validity of electronic mood charting methods (first objective) which will be an important contribution to the field.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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