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Reviewer's report:

In method section, the necessary corrections is not still applied. The following items are still unknown to me:

How the sample size is determined?
Au response- As previously mentioned, sample size was not determined, the sample was the available students who responded to the survey.

Do all students were selected? Because the authors were expressed “employing a convenience sample” (in page 5, line 132). Why 395 participants were selected? What was total number of students in each country? What percent of research population was participated in this study?

Au response- As mentioned in the previous review response, the number of 395 comprised the total number of available participants who responded to the survey. It was already stated in the text that the number of responses received represented 33% of the available cohort.

It was also already stated in the text that the total number of available students in the two countries was 1200. Additional text has been previously added to show how this figure is distributed across the two countries.

What percent of participants were completed the survey?
Au response- As mentioned previously the percentage of respondents who completed the survey from the available students was 33% ie: 395/1200=33%

Do face validity is sufficient to determine validity? Or content validity is required? Why the reliability of survey has not been determined?

Au response – As mentioned previously and noted in the manuscript, the survey was created for the purposes of this study. As previously mentioned face validity means the survey looks like it works and this was sufficient for the study at this stage. Content validity was determined by experienced mental health nurses (noted on page 5 of the manuscript). The researchers may investigate further in order to determine whether the test is valid and should be used in the future, however this was not part of the process here.

Also, it is better the survey descript clearly and explain about scoring of it.

Au response- text added

… that comprised of yes/no type questions, and multiple choices type questions. Frequencies were used to report the survey result information.
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Reviewer's report: not found

Editorial requirements:

Please state the full names and affiliations of the six ethics committees that approved the study, and add them to the Methods section.

Au response – added

Australian Catholic University HREC, University of Canberra HREC, University of Ballarat HREC, Queensland University of Technology HREC, University of Huddersfield HREC and Salford University HREC.