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Response to Reviewers

We thank the Reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. The paper is improved as a result of their efforts. Our responses to specific comments by each Reviewer are presented below. Note also that we have corrected some minor typographical errors and language issues throughout the manuscript.

Kees van Heeringen

1. This is an excellent suggestion, and these more recent studies are now cited.

2. More detail on the screening process is now provided. As we now report, the screening was completely anonymous, which did not allow for follow-up or further evaluation.

   In addition, we did not code the screening forms and hence cannot provide any information on the number of students screening positive.

3. Absences from school are now explained as the reason for almost all non-response.

4. As requested by the Reviewer, we have revised the Discussion section so as to not imply that the study has assessed changes in knowledge/attitudes but rather differences between experimental groups.

5. This is an important point that we have added to the discussion of the absence of pretest measures.

6. As the reviewer suggests, we now state in the Discussion that the results of this study are similar to the results obtained from previous curriculum-based suicide prevention programs. However, we felt that it was difficult to go beyond this general statement because of the absence of the sufficient statistics to calculate effect sizes that could be used to compare program effects across studies. In addition, we have also noted the fact that the absence of a pretest in our study precludes us from quantifying the changes in knowledge, attitudes & behavior following exposure to SOS. We feel that this will be sufficient to address the Reviewer’s concerns, but would be happy to revisit this issue if the Editor would like us to do so.

Jeremy Miles

1. The Reviewer requested exact p-values in Table 3. We looked at several options and ultimately agreed with the Reviewer that presenting p-values other than those for the intervention effects would be too cumbersome. We have addressed this concern by providing a range of p-values for intervention effects as a table note.