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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript presented systematic review and Meta-analysis on factors associated with suicidality in mainland China. The results of this paper might be useful information in suicide prevention. However, there are several areas where the paper needs to be clarified and edited, which I have highlighted below:

1. The title “Factors associated with suicide and suicidality in mainland China: A meta-analysis”, need to be clarified, can the authors explain what difference between suicide and suicidality?

2. The Abstract section: the form of the abstract is poor. The section should be written according by the guideline of the J, including Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion.

3. Introduction: at the third of the section, the author wrote" many studies have …… “, can the author give more examples except the demographic factors? As I seen from the discussion, the author only found the demographic factors in the present study is different from the previous study; I want to know whether there is other aspects on risk factors to suicide were reported inconsistent. Only more examples were given, can the sense of this manuscript were reflected, because meta-analysis are often used to solve controversial issue, and as the author wrote that there were the national data on suicide, it is not necessary to synthetize data by using meta-analysis.

4. Method: the authors need to describe more clear on literature search, such as “keyword”, “subject terms”, and "time limited” “population limited” etc, so others can repeat this process.

5. Method: the author need to clarify which effects model (fixed-effects models or random-effects models) were used when data synthesis were conducted.

6. As I known, publication bias are common in meta-analysis, however, the author don’t analysis the publication bias. I believe that the author did not do the funnel plot analysis, because in the “Discussion” the author wrote that “bias MAY have been introduced…”

7. Parts of the “Results” section can be left out, such as the literature screen process, but the subgroup figures need to be added.

8. The “discussion” need to deepen discussed. In this section, the authors not
only need to compare their own results with previous study, but also they need to try to explain the results. Such as why the suicide rate of female was higher than that of male before 2000, etc.

The whole paper need a thorough grammar check and editing. For example, the references number in the article don’t have a centralized from, and the whole paper need to be revised by a native speaker to correct the syntax errors.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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