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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: My overall impression of the study is that it is well constructed and executed. The topic is new and relevant which makes a scoping review an appropriate methodology. The article outlines the methods the authors used in a very meticulous and thorough manner. The results are what one might expect - but they lay the groundwork for further research in this new and emerging area of practice. The authors have done a good job outlining the issue, explaining their methods, displaying their results and outlining a path forward for future research. The questions they raise are relevant and their discussion of results do not go beyond the findings. The execution of the review seems sound and rigorous based on the description of their methods. The three main issues I have with the manuscript are: (1) a very low number of studies that were ultimately identified; (2) the results section was a bit hard to follow and convoluted in some areas; and (3) the details of internet based interventions (i.e. what they do, how they work) could have been better described and explained in the introduction. Perhaps some examples would have been helpful. I will further explain these issues below. Overall I think this is a good article that is worthy of publication with minor revisions.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I have three suggestions for revisions. First, explain more clearly the low number of results given the large number of initial studies (500+ and then 100+). What made the final number so low relative to the amount of initially identified studies given the inclusion and exclusion criteria. I'm not sure this is a limitation, just a bit more explanation is needed. Second and most importantly, I found myself getting a bit lost in the results section. There is a lot of information in this section. I'm not sure what the way forward is - but some clearer sectioning based on themes rather than research questions might help with the flow of the results. I found myself having trouble keeping it all straight and there may be some information that is less relevant than others in the results that could be removed in order to improve readability. Lastly, perhaps some concrete examples and more clarity on what internet & mobile based interventions are (what they look like) and what they actually do in the front section might help clarify the work being conducted. This is minor - but may help with conceptualizing this new area of practice. Overall this is a good article and with some minor revisions should be publishable. The authors are commended on the level of detail they included in their methods and locating the areas for future research.
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I have indicated what I think are the necessary revision above.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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:

Acceptable
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