Reviewer's report

Title: Explaining gender differences in non-fatal suicidal behaviour among adolescents: a population-based study

Version: 1 Date: 26 April 2011

Reviewer: Nestor Damian D. Kapusta

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. A large sample with appropriate hypotheses and power.

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. The authors adhere in the discussion to the results and discuss the results in the context of previous studies.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes. The major limitation (cross-sectional study) is well described, however, the authors might want to discuss that the explained variance (or its correlate Pseudo R² in all models) is clearly far below 100%. Thus suggesting that other factors could'nt been taken into account in the explaining paradigm.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes, the literature review covers a representative state of knowledge.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Very good, indeed.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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