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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer comments for the authors of "The experiences of people bereaved by suicide regarding the press reporting of the death: qualitative study" for BMC Public Health

This study aimed to explore experiences of people bereaved by suicide regarding media reporting of the suicide of their friend or relative. The authors conducted an online survey and collected data from 140 participants in the UK. Responses to open-ended questions were subjected to a qualitative analysis. The results showed that most experiences with journalists was negative. Furthermore, the authors identified considerable variation in people's views over acceptable levels of detail reported in the press.

The manuscript covers an interesting and important topic and is well written. With a lack of qualitative research in literature on suicide prevention, I also appreciate that fact that the authors conducted a qualitative study. Furthermore, conclusions are in line with the results presented in the paper. I only have a couple of suggestions for manuscript improvement, and most of them are minor points:

1) The authors have limited their sample to adults of 40 years of age. They explain in the manuscript why they have excluded children from the study, but not why they have excluded individuals older than 40 years of age. Such an explanation would be desirable.
2) The authors should provide more details on intercoder reliability. First, how many responses (%) were analyzed by both coders for intercoder reliability? Second, please provide Krippendorff’s alphas or Cohen's kappas to assess intercoder reliability. It is crucial that all items of the analysis have an intercoder reliability of $>0.70$.
3) In Table 1, the SE status numbers need explanation in a footnote.
4) On page 9, the authors provide IQR for the age of their sample. What is a little bit confusing to me is the fact that a range has been provided here. I assume that these are the numbers in terms of Q25 and Q75. However, IQR usually is provided with one specific number, not a range.
5) The last paragraph on page 14 is unclear and needs some revision.
6) On page 16, the authors mention some sub-themes. These sub-themes, however, are only explained a little bit later in the manuscript. I think a clear outline of all themes and sub-themes need to be provided at the beginning of the results.
7) Some results are illustrated with only one example. I think it would be helpful to illustrated all major findings with at least 2 or 3 good examples.
8) Overall, the manuscript is well-written. However, on a few occasion during interpretation of the results, the language suddenly becomes a little bit "unscientific" and colloquial (e.g., "head-
grabbing story", page 19). The authors may want to check the language throughout the entire manuscript.

9) On pages 26-27, the authors discuss explanations for the respondent's bad experiences with journalists. One possible explanation is not mentioned here: the lack of time journalists have to write their stories. This is an essential component and should be included in the discussion section.
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