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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Mr Todd

Please find attached our revised manuscript in response to the reviewers’ comments. We thank them for their helpful comments.

In response to Lorann Stallones
- Point 2 – more detail of the network method has been included – particularly to describe the terms OutDegree and InDegree, and also how the median rank scores in table 6 were derived.
- Point 6 – a limitations section has been added.

In response to Cheryl L Beseler

Compulsory revisions
- Point 1 - as per above – the methods section has been expanded – the paragraphs have been reordered to reflect the sequence of activities.
- Point 2 & 3 – the “position similarity” of agency informants is described – “the most senior service provider” – and we note that similarity of position depended on agency size.
- Point 4 – greater discussion is now included on the network bounding – and how we sought to minimise omission of listing any agencies in the local network.
- Point 5 – we have noted that one of the limitations of the study is that we do not know the impact on the results of the missing network data from the non respondents – however, we have noted that the distribution of agency sectors was fairly even and that our use of InDegree data has meant that we do have information on links related to all the agencies on our network lists.
- Point 6 – the timing of mental health first aid training in these four shires in response to the drought is now more clearly described.
- Point 7 & 8 – a copy of the survey has now been included as an appendix and the standardised administration described.
· Point 9 – the statistical methods are now included in the methods section.
· Point 10, 11 & 12 – while we did not conduct a statistical test of reliability or factor analysis to establish instrumentation rigour, the techniques that we did use to maximise validity and reliability are now included.
· Point 13 – we have included in the limitations section some discussion about why these p values may have differed.
· Points 14 & 15 – we have included more interpretation from us about the findings in the discussion section, particularly pertaining to the readiness of and training that would be helpful to support agricultural agencies. Regarding general practitioners we do note that they were highly linked on clinical activities, but less so on “working together in other way” as we would expect given their clinical focus.

Minor revisions:
· Point 1 – grammar checked
· Point 2 – future work now mentioned in the conclusion
· Point 3 – the role of these agencies in dealing with family tensions described
· Point 4 – we did not intend to suggest that these were representative shires – but rather that they had not had any recent training (ie the pre drought situation status quo) – this has now been reworded.