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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

In general I think this study is interesting, especially the information revealed from the focus interviews. However, I think the manuscript has to deal with some main issues before publications.

Title: The title mirrors nicely the content of the study.

Abstract:
The results reported in the abstract do not fully answer the aim in that there is nothing said about mental health. Further, the conclusions do not follow in a clear way upon the results (Major Compulsory Revisions).

Introduction:
In general the introduction seems to bring up relevant literature and it is easy for the reader to follow. However, the aims of the study are not clearly stated (Major Compulsory Revisions). Are the two “gaps” referring to the aims of the study? If so, these gaps are only partly in line with the aim stated in the abstract.

Method:
Under the heading “Survey measures”, first paragraph: The authors have to give more information to the reader regarding “sets of question” (Major Compulsory Revisions). Are the questions from a validated questionnaire? What are the psychometric properties? I need this kind of information on several occasions where the authors refer to “sets of questions”.

Further, under the heading “Focus group design and sample”, second paragraph, I wonder how the selection of young men that was done with purpose to develop the schedule of questions was done.

A minor issue is that I would have preferred to have the information about the subjects in the method part instead of in the result part. This yields both the headings “Online sample” and “Focus group sample”.

Under the heading “Data analysis”, the first paragraph: Which variables may age be a predictor of?

Result part:
Since the aims are not clearly stated it is a little confusing with the three headings referring to the online survey. For example, I have not seen the question about “Responses to a friend with a mental health problem” be brought up in the aims. Lastly, the authors have to be clear that no causal conclusions could be drawn since the study is using cross-sectional data (Major Compulsory Revisions).

Discussion part:
I miss a discussion about the comparison between the results from the survey and the focus group interviews since the authors stress that it is strength to have both kind of methods in the same study (Major Compulsory Revisions). As it is written now it is not clear for me in what way it is strength. In addition, the authors mostly discuss the results from the focus groups.
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