Author’s response to reviews

Title: Cultural adaptation of Internet- and mobile-based interventions for mental disorders: a systematic review protocol.

Authors:

Kerstin Spanhel (kerstin.spanhel@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)

Sumeyye Balci (sumeyye.balci@uni-ulm.de)

Harald Baumeister (harald.baumeister@uni-ulm.de)

Juergen Bengel (bengel@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)

Lasse Sander (lasse.sander@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)

Version: 2 Date: 07 May 2020

Author’s response to reviews:

Point-to-point response to the comments from the editor

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers again their work on our manuscript and the important feedback. We found the listed points very helpful for the quality of the manuscript and have addressed them in the manuscript.
In the following, we will respond to the editor’s comments. Additionally, amendments are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer reports:

I have two minor comments following on from the original reviewer comments and responses, and I would like these to be addressed briefly:

1. It is important to acknowledge in the manuscript and not only in the response to the reviewers why you have made this decision about peer-reviewed literature. Reasons may include not only the availability of several studies in the peer-reviewed literature but also that you think there is little information in the grey literature and searching the grey literature is onerous. In the completed review itself you may wish to acknowledge that if there is a difference in findings between studies available in the published peer-reviewed literature and studies available only in the grey literature, the findings of this review will be biased towards the more readily available literature – but I don't think you need to include this caveat in the protocol.
Reply: Thank you very much for this helpful comment. We have addressed the issue in the manuscript and will certainly be keeping the important note for the completed review in mind.

Changes in the manuscript (Par. Eligibility criteria, p.6):
(k) Only peer-reviewed journal articles will be included to guarantee a high quality of the extracted data. We assume that the information in grey literature will not significantly affect our research questions, as sufficient information will be available in peer-reviewed literature. In order to save resources, Grey literature will thus be excluded.

2. Culture is a complex word as it can refer to a national or ethnic culture but also to groups formed by other shared core beliefs, behaviors, or values. Examples might be different socioeconomic groups, professional groups, different religions, sexual minorities, etc. It seems from the review rationale and focus on LMIC that you are speaking of adaptations to national, regional or ethnic groups so it would be helpful to have this explicit in the PICO (pages 5-6) if so.

Reply: This is a very important hint, thank you very much. We changed the manuscript following your suggestion and made our usage of the culture term more clearly.

Changes in the manuscript:
(Par. Eligibility criteria, p.5) Studies are eligible for inclusion (a) if the target group differs from the target group of the original intervention in terms of culture, i.e. nationality or ethnicity.
(Table 1, p.6) (d) People with a cultural (i.e. national or ethnic) background differing from the initial target group of the intervention

We, again, thank the editor and the reviewers for their helpful feedback and their time and effort. We hope we could address all issues according to the editor’s wishes and find that the resulting amendments have improved the manuscript.