

Peer Review

Review of: "Online Community Reinforcement and Family Training (CRAFT) for Concerned Significant Others in Rural Australia: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Tove Wahlund¹

1. Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institute Stockholm, Sweden

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work. This is a well-written paper on an RCT of CRAFT for concerned significant others in rural Australia. The introduction is clear and argues effectively for the need for accessible programs for individuals supporting loved ones with substance abuse in rural areas.

I have a few suggestions for minor revisions.

Methods:

1. I would like to see the eligibility criteria in the paper itself, as it would help the reader understand if the authors have reached the intended study population.
2. In the description of the intervention, 'milestone conversations' occur in several sessions. For readers not knowledgeable in CRAFT, I would like a brief mention and description of this concept. Are the conversations intended to help change the IP's usage of substances? If so, is that effect measured, and if so, how?
3. 'Participants could access two additional sessions for additional support and skill consolidation.' - did this mean they had additional time for the whole treatment package, and more contact with the practitioner?
4. 'The four practitioners who did not acquire accreditation delivered 22 sessions altogether.' - how come practitioners who did not acquire accreditation still provided sessions?

5. Under primary and secondary outcomes, it says that the primary outcome was the self-reported psychological well-being of the CSO. Several scales are presented underneath, but it is unclear which, if any, of these was the primary measure. Please clarify.
6. Concerning the scales, please add the number of items and range (lowest-highest) for each. It would facilitate the reader's assessment of the magnitude of the change on each outcome.

Results/discussion:

1. It is somewhat unclear what time points are intended by OM1, OM2, and OM3. What is the interval between them? Maybe the changes in the waitlist group once they get the intervention could be presented in a graph of its own, separate from the intervention group (as done, for instance, by Jolstedt et al. 2018, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S235246421830275X>), I believe it would clarify for the reader.
2. The adjusted mean differences, confidence intervals, and effect sizes for each outcome are presented in the results section, as well as p-values. However, I would like to see either a calculation of the Reliable Change Index in the results or a discussion about whether the change is clinically significant in the discussion section, to help the reader understand the clinical impact of the changes. This could, for instance, be a comparison to the level of change seen in previous studies.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.