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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? - Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? - Yes
3. Are the data sound? - Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? - Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? - Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? - Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? - Yes

(Very) minor revisions

The sentences referring to ‘delivering mental health literacy’ (p12 and 14) sound strange and could be reworded as mental health literacy (defined as “knowledge and beliefs about mental disorders which aid their recognition, management or prevention”) is an individual attribute rather than something that can be delivered.

Discretionary revisions

Given that the authors include a section on help-seeking theories and models in the Introduction, it would be interesting to see the results of the review discussed in the context of these theories.
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