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Reviewer's report:

This paper proposes a way of considering patient safety in autonomous e-mental health systems. In general, the approach makes sense. However, the paper needs more details and evidence. Below are suggestions for addressing these issues.

1) In the background, the authors state "AEMH's are interesting, as they provide a way of breaking down these social barriers, helping people at home or on their mobile phone, for comparatively low cost". This argument is lacking evidence and very broad statement. The authors should modulate and qualify the very broad statements they make.

2) In the Discussion, "In the design of the protocols, care was taken to ensure they would be generalizable to a broad range of different AEMH systems." In the previous sentence, we need more evidence of 'generalizable'.

3) And "Several other directions for future research can be established. Application of the detection model in different types of AEMH systems could reveal whether it fully covers the important decisions in detecting risk in AEMH." This sentence is not clear why future research is relevant. Please explain.

4) Figure 1,4 is no readable.

5) I think it would be appropriate to replace Table 1 with a figure. Because, color and shading may not be used

6) The height of the first row of the entire table should be the same

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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