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Reviewer's report:

Thank-you for inviting me to review this interesting paper which describes the findings of a survey and a focus group study exploring young men’s attitudes and behaviour in relation to mental health and technology.

The focus of this paper is clear and it is well written. The manuscript is presented in an appropriate format. The title and abstract are fine and the introduction presents a solid rationale for the current pair of studies. The methods appear generally appropriate, although more detail would be needed for replication –this needs to be revised. The data appear sound. The discussion is well written and appropriate. Some important limitations of the work are acknowledged. It isn’t clear where the data on female participants is going to be published, or how this compares with the male’s data, which is a shame.

Overall this is an interesting paper, and I expect it will be acceptable for publication after some relatively small but essential amendments.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Overall the methods need a bit of attention. As they stand it would not be possible to replicate this study in another lab due to a lack of information about recruitment and measures.

1. Methods paragraph one.
It isn’t clear how participants were recruited to the survey – where on Facebook was an advert placed?

2. Methods paragraph 2, 3,4,
I’d like to see a little more detail of the response options and scoring frames used for the survey sections.

It is not clear what demographic variables were collected.

It isn’t clear how focus group participants were recruited.

4. Methods final paragraph.
Did you use some guidance or any particular approach to the thematic analysis?
A reference for the approach taken would be helpful.
It would be helpful to report what kind in training/ expertise the 2 researchers who conducted the thematic analysis had in these methods.

5. Results paragraph 2. (and through-out the results section) Please don't report p=.000, change these to p<.001.

6. Qualitative results throughout
You need to chose a level of detail with which to report info about your participants from whom you quote – e.g. in one case it says, high school student (occupation), 17 (age), and Sydney NSW ( location), on the next it just says high school student(occupation).

- Discretionary Revisions

Results paragraph one.
It would be helpful to report the number and percentage of participants who were unemployed, so the reader doesn't have to work this out themselves from the data presented.

Results throughout
You have explored the role of age as a moderator of your findings, but not occupational status – I wonder if this might be helpful too?
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