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General

Interesting review topic. In general, the article will gain in clarity by adding more definition and better define the objective (for example pathology). The structure of the article is presented as "classic" way to present a scoping review. On the overall reading, I found it a bit heavy, and might gain clarity if sections are shorter.

One of the main recommendation is to provide more definition and better present the focus of the scoping review. I tried my level best to provide some comments for each sections, but I found difficult to read through as the background section doesn't include a clear presentation of the objectives and definitions.

Background

Terminology such as internet based interventions, support recovery and self-management should be precisely define, as they can have several meanings and interpretations for the readers. Maybe to better target the review, if was only psychosis to start directly. Use the general for the discussion if needed, to compare others interventions for others SMI.

In the background, clarity will be gain to focus on one terminology or one pathology, psychosis, SMI, schizophrenia…to better define the scope of the review from the beginning (or to present the lit review separately). Will help to better define web based interventions with more precise example for example as well as mobile with example of messages sent.

In line 57/58, reader might better understand with more details what is for example to monitor symptoms as this can typically be understood differently (which symptoms)

Drop out of programs can be due to the design itself and not the objective (for example content). I will recommend if you let this sentence, to develop the idea (or to add it to discussion section)
Methods

This section will gain clarity if it was shorter. As other publication exists, might consider to refer more to others articles that used the same methodology instead of developing each sections in detail.

Better defining the concept in the background, will help the reader better understand the research questions.

The review questions appear very general (might be my perception as I am not an expert in scoping review).

Results

Authors might consider in the beginning of this section not to list but rather only to present through tables. Presentation of the results, too much narrative that hide the main results by review questions. Might consider to reorganize to better highlight the result by questions. To consider to provide more sections under each 3 questions to better highlight the results.

Discussion

This section might be clearer if all concept are define in the beginning, as previously stated. Again, too many informations, datas that hide the main objectives while reading.

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

No

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.

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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