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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The low response rate:
The authors admit that the very low response rate is a limitation. The comment about response rate as a function of remoteness now includes a sentence in the text saying that “The previous two comparative studies of mental health literacy and remoteness also failed to report this data”, which is pointless. A serious limitation is that as the study does not include the possibly different response rates in different areas, the response rate may also vary as a function of remoteness. This may strongly affect the analysis of mental health literacy or attitudes to mental health in the different populations.

The large number of tables:
Considering the few significant findings in the study, the number of tables still ought to be reduced. Again, the notion by the author that previous studies include too many tables is pointless.

Educational background:
The authors have included a sentence under Limitations, ”… in controlling for the effects of educational level, it was only possible to classify the data into two broad categories.” The consequence of this ought to be mentioned, namely that the results of the present study may be explained by differences in educational level in the different populations that are not elucidated.
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