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Reviewer's report:

The author partially responded to my comments. For instance they added sub-headings in the result section, but the thematic analysis is the same as the first version, so still remain very superficial.

The interview schedule also add concerns...for instance, the interview schedule was not designed to investigate similarity and differences between the reason for attempting suicide reported by attempters and family members (e.g., questions: How prevalent do you think suicide is in Ghana today? Do you think it will change in the future? Do you think suicide can be prevented?). Maybe this paper is a secondary analysis of data collected for other purposes? Of course this is perfectly acceptable, but it should be clearly stated.

Also, the interview schedule contain a lot of close questions (yes/no questions, such as "In general do people talk about suicide?") and most worryingly - inductive questions, such as: "So did you feel sad, guilty, depressed?" For the first point, the author may want to clarify which questions actually provided qualitative data, but for the second issue I am afraid nothing can be done at this stage.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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