Reviewer’s report

Title: Perceived stigma and barriers to care in UK Armed Forces personnel and veterans with and without probable mental disorders

Version: 0 Date: 06 Sep 2019

Reviewer: A Birgitta Gunnarsson

Reviewer's report:
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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.
Thank you for offering to read your manuscript. I am sorry, I am not known in logistic regressions. However, I have some suggestions in order to increase usability of your findings.

Minor issues:

Abstract.
The aim should be in imperfect. Add design and data analysis.

Keywords.
Please change to other keywords, which already are included in the title (stigma, barriers to care, veterans).

Background.
P3. Does AF means Armed Forces?
P4. Add (5) after Iversen et al.
P4. The aims should be in imperfect.

Methods.
P4. Insert a sentence regarding design of the study before the ethics.
P4. Participants. Some of these sentences belong to "design". I miss inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria.

Discussion.
Discuss the strengths and weakness in terms of internal validity, reliability and finally external validity. I miss the practical implications; how can the readers/clinicians make use of your study?
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.

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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