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Reviewer's report:

This review investigates if Internet-based interventions that focus on recovery and self-management in patients with psychotic severe mental illness can improve the relationship between health service users and health service workers. Internet-based interventions are only recently developed and rarely integrated into the general care of mentally diseased patients. The authors suggest that Internet-based interventions might be most valuable supporting recovery and recurrence of severe mental illness. The review is well written and of high methodological quality. Nevertheless, there are some revisions need to be made.

Major Comments

Abstract

1. Page 2, Line 19-21: The fact that Internet-based interventions can both support and burden the relationship between the service user and the worker is important and interesting. However, without any further explanation, this statement is confusing. A short explanation is given in line 26-27. Please try to better fit the proximity of these statements.

Introduction

2. Page 4, Line 50-51: This is the first time you mention a focus on psychosis in the introduction. However, it remains inconclusive why you are focusing on patients with psychosis. Please explain in more detail.

3. Page 5, Line 62-74: This paragraph explains problems in implementing Internet-based interventions and in particular why the drop-out might be high sometimes. However, remarking the problems and explaining them seems a bit mixed up. Please try to restructure the paragraph. I would suggest first to note possible problems and afterwards to discuss possible reasons (or vice versa) as you are not describing possible reasons for all problems.
4. Page 6, Line 90-93: Why you are focusing on the user-worker relationship and on recovery is getting clear. Nevertheless, it remains unclear for me why you are focusing on patients with psychosis and why you are including self-management. Both facts are just shortly mentioned in a few sentences. Please try to revise your introduction to make this focus more clearly.

Methods

5. Page 7, Line 131-132: Have former reviews been excluded? If yes, why? Are there any reviews made so far that would match the inclusion criteria?

Results

6. Page 10, Line 212-213: Did qualitative and quantitative methods differ in their MMAT-score? If yes, which one had higher scores and why? (Note: You are shortly referring to possible differences in the last sentence of the paragraph.)

7. Page 11, Line 235-236: If mechanisms underpinning the interventions were provided, what were these theories/mechanisms like? Please shortly explain.

8. Page 12, paragraph 1 and 2: You explain the usage and effects of the interventions in detail. Please try to provide a summary of the interventions. How often have the interventions been used? Why/Why not? How long have the interventions been used?

9. Page 15, Line 336-338: The supporting factors are very interesting and seem fundamental. Please explain them in more detail.

10. Page 15, Paragraph "Feelings of mistrust": You very clearly explain why Internet-based might be not used sometimes. But please specify and explain how not-using is related to a worse relationship between users and workers if they are still meeting regularly.

11. Page 16, Last paragraph: Do you have any idea why these interventions did work that well compared to the interventions used with the usual mental health worker? Please try to explain.

12. Page 17, Paragraph "Does using Internet-based interventions ...": Are there any follow-up data investigating these question? What is the impact on recovery and self-management?
Discussion

13. Page 19, Line 447-451: These results have not been mentioned before. See also Comment 12. I would suggest relocating these sentences to the results section.

14. Page 20, Line 468-471: If the interventions are mostly used to set therapy goals and agendas, why is it important to continue its usage afterwards? Please describe in more detail.

Minor Comments

15. Page 4, Line 48: severe mental illness = SMI (see also: page 20, line 492). Please recheck your manuscript for the usage of the abbreviation.

16. Page 11, Line 218: What was the sample size of HTP?


18. Table 2, Koivunen & Huhtasalo, Workers/Profession: Is IT (information technology) meant or is it the wrong abbreviation?

19. Table 2, Abbreviations: FU is not used in the table.

20. Table 3, Abbreviations: RCT is not mentioned in the abbreviations but used. CM is mentioned but not used.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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