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Reviewer's report:

Thankyou for the opportunity to review this paper. The paper states its aim is to analyse experience of patients, psychiatrist and other health staff in the use of VC for consultations in psychiatric emergencies and how the technology influences their confidence.

Review:

Title: The title is informative and clear

Abstract: The abstract is concise. I found the statement in results regarding finding number 4) “as a safety net, also when VC is it used” a little confusing in the abstract. I was unsure from the abstract how it could be a safety net if it was not used. Perhaps for the abstract it may be easier for the reader to allude to the use of the ‘safety net’ of VC and leave the explanation of it being a safety net when not used for the main text.

Background:

The background is well structured and presents the justification for the analysis of emergency psychiatric care via VC well.

Methods: The methods used are clear and appropriate to answer the research question. The authors have presented the research undertaken in line with many of the COREQ guidelines (guidelines for reporting qualitative research)., although now specific mention is made of adhering to these guidelines, and some items in the guidelines checklist have not been addressed.

Results: The results are informative and plausible. The illustrative quotes used highlight are appropriate and highlight the results.

Discussion: The discussion is well structured and provides a nicely rounded reflection on the findings in this study which are supporting by the data. The authors clearly acknowledge the work they are building upon and provide indications of areas for further research.

Major compulsory revisions: N/A

Minor essential revisions:

1. There is no limitations section in the manuscript. This should be included at the end of the discussion.
Discretionary revisions:

1. The abstract could be modified as suggested above.
2. The authors could present the findings according to the COREQ guidelines.
3. While the writing is acceptable, there are some grammatical errors which are likely due to English being a second language. However these errors do not detract from the meaning or readers understanding of the manuscript.
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