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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well written and important systematic review of health outcomes associated with suicide bereavement.

I recommend some minor revisions to the discussion as follows:

In the discussion, it is not clear what is meant by "kinship" (Line 383):

Therefore, it appears that kinship may be associated with the risk of adverse outcomes following suicide bereavement.

Are you describing the difference in impact between children and adults by using the term "kinship" if yes this needs to be described in more detail.

Line 392 - use of the term "death" would it be more appropriate to use "suicide"

The first two paragraphs of the discussion are far too long and both extend over 1 page each - these need to be confined to smaller paragraphs to make the meaning of each clearer.

Line 414 - shame and stigma, this should be referenced and it would be good to develop this explanation further, I recommend a short paragraph on this - there is a large body of evidence linking shame/stigma and poor health outcomes, and this is highly relevant to suicide bereavement.

After the limitations and strengths, please describe the implications of this review - what specifically does it mean for future research? Be more explicit.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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