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Reviewer’s report:

This study titled "Suicide Portrayal in the Canadian Media: Examining Newspaper Coverage of the Popular Netflix Series '13 Reasons Why'" is a very interesting effort. It combines quantitative and qualitative study measures and tries to define the situation of media, regarding suicide issue. It starts with a well-constructed introduction, however, the Methods, Results and Discussion are not well-written. The way the paper is written gives more impression of a narrative summary rather than a scientific evaluation. The authors need to express their scientific efforts more thoroughly and in detail. My comments for the paper are as follows:

Introduction; A well constructed and informative introduction

Methods:

1. The newspapers covered are not clearly described. How are the best-selling papers determined? Is there such a list in Canada? Please give reference to that list. "Over 20 best-selling Canadian print newspapers" is not a good description of your study coverage. Please be precise.

2. Please give more information about your search tool FP Infomart (its advantages and search strategy)

3. "Highly-trained researcher"? If such mentioning is necessary, specify what the training is about?

4. Give the results of your search in numbers? How many articles were obtained in total? How many were excluded? How many were duplicates?

5. Why was the data collection limited to three-month period? The number of articles could be increased with a wider time interval. Why did you choose to take it shorter? Please give the rationale for this?

6. Mindset was described to have 14 items. Why did you choose to select only five of them? What are the other items and why were they eliminated? Please specify. (14 items can be given as a Supplementary Table as well.)
7. The weakest part of the Methods part is the description of the qualitative analysis. The authors need a more scientific description of their qualitative analysis. How did you organise your data? Did you use any software for qualitative analysis? How did you label your data? How did you identify your framework? If all these questions are answered systematically, your qualitative work becomes a scientific paper, or else it is a narrative summary. Please refer to papers with qualitative assessments.

Results:

1. The results have been summarized under two titles: praises and criticisms. Some explanations under each title seem not to belong there. Please re-evaluate.

2. Words like "around, almost, vast majority" do not belong to results part. You can use these in discussion. Results need to be precisely worded.

3. The discussion has comments beyond what results reveal. Please stick to what your results can say.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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