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Dear Editorial Team Members,

**Re. “Development and evaluation of a youth mental health community awareness campaign - The Compass Strategy” ID No. 1661418290465927**

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this manuscript so that it may be reconsidered for publication. Outlined below is our response to each reviewer’s main points.

*Reviewer: Vanessa Pinfold*

#1 More detail has been included in the data sections. Specifically, the details regarding the Key Performance Indicator categories have been provided in the Process Evaluation component of the Results section (p. 26, paragraph 2). Non-significant data has now been included in the Impact Evaluation component of the Results section (p. 23, paragraph 2) and Table 3 amended accordingly.

#2 Due to practical difficulties in gathering data over the whole intervention region, the planned outcome evaluation will not be able to be completed (see Results section - Outcome Evaluation, p. 23) therefore this data cannot be included.

#3 The comparison region is now described in the Setting component of the Methods section (p. 7, paragraph 2).

#4 The repeated word “applied” has been removed from the Background section, paragraph one, line 9.

*Reviewer: Sue Bailey*

#5 The degree of leakage of mental health information into the comparison region has been more clearly quantified in paragraph 5 of the Discussion section (p. 25) to read “a small amount of media distribution error” so that its impact on the study design can be more clearly interpreted by the reader. Hence we do not believe it to be a “considerable limitation”. However we have highlighted this potential limitation in the Results section of the Abstract so that it is apparent to the reader as early as possible. The limitations of interpreting the purpose of use of the website when the referrer has been “school” has been outlined in paragraph 6 of the Discussion section (p. 26).

#6 See change to Abstract outlined under #5.

#7 The breadth and comorbid nature of mental disorders in adolescence and young adulthood have been highlighted in paragraph 2 of the Background section (p. 4). A reference to childhood mental disorders has not been included as this study only relates to adolescents and young adults.
Many campaigns beyond Australia have been referred to in the Background (p.4, paragraph 1) and Discussion (p.26, paragraphs 2 & 3; p. 27, paragraph 2) sections including studies from Britain, Norway, USA, Canada, Germany and Singapore. Campaigns specifically targeting school populations have not been included, as comparisons would be difficult given that the setting for this intervention was community wide. Although schools were a sub-setting, they were not evaluated separately. The work of Helen Cowie was not reviewed as it seems to only relate to interventions around bullying and peer support in schools, rather than awareness of or help seeking for mental disorders.

“Next steps and feasibility of replication …” have been included in the Conclusion section (p.27 & p.28).

In this manuscript revision we have also included some additional PDF files which are examples of The Compass Strategy campaign material. We believe this will add to the quality of the manuscript.

I look forward to your response to these manuscript revisions.

Yours faithfully,

Annemarie Wright.