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Reviewer's report:

This paper reports on the understudied topic of ethical concerns in the context of internet-based suicide prevention research, and how researchers deal with such concerns.

Overall, the paper was well-organized, the methods and results were clearly described. A few questions and suggestions.

Introduction

Page 3, line 4: delete "future"
Page 3, line 6: I suggest replacing "suicide-related behaviour" with suicidal behaviour to be consistent throughout the paper.

The introduction (especially page 3) was based on the literature regarding ethics in suicide research. Surprisingly this recent study was not mentioned. Please consider including:


Page 4, lines 2-3: The text mentions several potential advantages of internet-based research but is silent about potential disadvantages such as selective (non-representative) samples and high drop-out rates.

Method

Page 5: include a definition of an "integrative review".
Page 5, line 14: Could authors give an example of such a "key" conference?
Page 5, lines 11-14: Were there any limitations to the searches, such as year of publication (or year of conference), location or language?
Page 5, lines 16-17: What type of studies were included? All? Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods? Studies with and/or without control group?
What were the exclusion criteria?
What was the strategy regarding studies with blended interventions (interventions with an online and offline component)?
Page 6, lines 3-4: The survey aimed to recruit multiple respondents per study. Were the replies of multiple respondents grouped per study? If not, this method could have introduced a serious bias to the data.

Page 6, line 22: I suggest replacing "to identify codes" with to allocate codes, or to code the data. The current phrase suggests that authors have found the codes in the data, while they were provided / labeled by the researchers.

Results

Page 7, line 7, lines 14-22, lines 23-line 7(page8), page 8(lines7-10): Include the references of the studies in the text.

Page 8, line 13: earlier it was said that respondents were encouraged to report their co-authors to the researchers so that they could be invited as well. Were these researchers included in the 30 "individual researchers"?

Page 13, lines 6-7: This seems to be a repetition of the previous lines. Consider deleting.

Discussion

Page 16, line 22; page 17, line 3; and page 18, line 8: I am unsure what you mean with "consumers with lived experience of suicidal behaviour". It might be more clear to say research participants.

Limitations

Page 17, lines 15-17: It could also be that people with negative experiences want to participate to vent their frustration, while those with positive experiences feel no need to participate.

Table 1

The references of the studies must be included in the text and in the list of references.

Good luck with the revision!

**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

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal