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Reviewer's report:

The authors present an good qualitative analysis on the use of videoconferencing for emergency psychiatric consultations.

The methods are appropriate. The interview quotes are used well to support the results. The conclusions are important for practice.

The manuscript does need some editing to bring up to publication standard English.

I would like to make the following comments

Minor Essential Revisions

Material and Methods

1. Paragraph 2: The statement 'with very limited research evidence' should not be in the methods. This is justification for doing the study and should go in the Background section. (See Discretionary Revisions Comment 1)

2. Paragraph 3: Descriptive statistics about participants should be included in Results not Materials and Methods.

3. Paragraph 4: 'Because of the large variation regarding VC experience' this statement should included in Results e.g. Interview varied in length form 34 - 80 minutes. Reasons for variation in length could be included in Discussion but not Results.

Results

4. Paragraph 1 belongs in the Background section not Results

5. Paragraph 2 'Especially this quotes from patient 3.....'belongs in Discussion not Results

6. Paragraph 7 'The use of VC was therefore regarded......' belongs in Discussion not Results

Discussion
7. Paragraph 1 is repetitive and should be removed
8. A Limitations sections should be included in Discussion.

Conclusion
9. The authors draw a very interesting point 'This safety argument is of major interest, because it challenges the idea of frequent uses as a success criterion for technological innovation'. I believe this is an important finding of the study hence, should also be included in the Conclusion.

10. The authors state that 'VC may improve the confidence...' and 'VC can be used for building a decentralise...'. However, it is not just the technology ie.VC but the medical service that is important. The authors should rephrase e.g. 'an emergency psychiatric service delivered by VC' or 'a decentralised psychiatric service enabled by VC' or similar.

Discretionary Revisions
1. I believe the paper could be improved with a more clearly stated aim and justification.
2. I believe it is better in scientific publications to use the word reported rather than mentioned e.g. some of the psychiatrists reported....
3. The sentence 'Both in psychiatric and somatic medicine, these are characterised by complexity, uncertainty........' is included in the Discussion section. This sentence provides clear and strong justification for performing the study and may be better used in the Background section .(see Comment 1 above)

Minor issues not for publication
1. videoconferencing and video conferencing is not used consistently

Abstract
2. paragraph 1: to areas with lack of psychiatrists -> to areas which lack psychiatrists or to areas with a lack of psychiatrists
3. paragraph 1: I believe the use of 'situations characterised by uncertainty' should be omitted from abstract or put in a separate sentence
4. paragraph 3: I believe the use of 'also when VC is not used' should be omitted from abstract as it causes confusion.

Background
5. paragraph 1: out-patient -> outpatient
6. paragraph 1: day-treatment -> day treatment
7. paragraph 1: de-instituionalisation and deinstitutionalisation not used consistently
8. paragraph 3: regarding to consult a psychiatrist is not clear and should be
restated.
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