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Reviewer’s report:

General comments:

The authors have responded to all previous comments. Some issues still need to be resolved (see also comments to authors' response in separate attachment). Furthermore, the authors should clearly define the following terms that are used in the report: effectiveness, feasibility, health outcomes. As written now, it seems like the authors interpret process measures (such as adherence, self-management) as health outcomes. However, it is not self-evident that e.g., better adherence to recommendations will also lead to better health outcomes. More clear definitions of the abovementioned terms may impact the reporting of results - namely the number of studies demonstrating improved health outcomes.

Specific comments (page linenumber):

4.27: "the main causes" -> "the main cause"

4.47ff: "Behavioral interventions […] have been studied [9, 11]": It would be interesting to read about the results of the interventions.

8.21: "…met inclusion and exclusion criteria…” > "…met inclusion criteria…”

8.53: "Among the 12 studies reviewed, 10 studies…": The authors should add references to the specific studies that they refer to. This applies to all parts in the manuscript where specific studies are referenced.

10.4: Can the authors clarify what is meant by "quality of outcomes"?

10.41: For reference [29], no statistics are reported - as done for the other studies. How come?

11.56: "about half" -> "half"

12.43: Add a reference after "…the data collection process."

12.46: "…found that symptoms were reported differently on paper-based questionnaire and mobile phone." Can the authors clarify this? What was the difference?
12.56: "RCT studies in the intervention articles…" -> "The intervention studies…"

13.31: "Only one study was judged to be at high risk of reporting bias". Please explain.

13.34: "Hagglund et al. had low risk for only for reportin bias" -> "Hägglund et al. had low risk only for reporting bias".

13.59: "chronic diseases such as…" -> "chronic diseases including…"

14.7: Please explain what is meant by "support the effectiveness of…"

17.47: "Automade" -> "Automated"?

**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.

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**
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