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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
The main limitation of the study were; 1- Low response rate, 457 participants (37.5%) were somehow against the study and MAY have objected it by withdrawing their consent. Following up these patients in your advanced prevention suicide system would be helpful if data were included in the results section. 2-On the other hand 106 out of 356 patients (30%) did not read crisis postcard and have not been shown what their outcomes was. Withdrawing these people from the study, might include selection bias. This bias would be more relevant if you see “previous history of suicide” in table 1 and see 50% of these patients (compare to 35% in two other groups) had previous acts. Considering the main outcome which is suicide repetition, the baseline characteristic data should convince the readers that there were no significantly differences among main groups. Adding a column to show baseline statistically differences could clear it.

3- The report starts with an indication that the patients included in the study are ones who presented with any degree of suicidal intention. Furthermore lethal suicidal methods were shown in Table 1. Suicidal intention has a considerable range and to include every patient who has any degree of suicidal ideation as a suicide attempter is misleading. So relation between subgroups and every subsequent suicide reattempts (Table 2) should carefully analyze at least based on lethal suicide methods which are shown before.
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