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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract: the results pertaining to hospitalization period and time since suicide attempt (i.e., more than 1 month) are not presented in the Results section of the manuscript. These results are also discussed in the Discussion (page 10; a comment on time since suicide attempt and modifying inclusion criterion). Can you please add these findings to the Results section?

2. Page 8, last para of results: If I'm interpreting this correctly, these are results that link to the objective of obtaining preliminary evidence on emergent risk factors. If this is correct, when I review Figure 1 (risk factors model), I don't readily see where food group consumption fits in. Could this be clarified?

3. Grammatical notes: Page 3, third line: "The objectives of this study were" (not 'are'). Page 4, line 9: "Exclusion criteria included the" (not 'include ability').

Discretionary Revisions
1. On page 2, objective 4 (preliminary evidence on emergent risk factors), it's not clear to me how this addresses feasibility for the main study. Could this possibly be clarified?

2. On page 3, one of the study inclusion criteria was ability to follow study procedures. Could you clarify how this was determined a priori?

3. Page 7, Results: Is it possible to better link the results to the domains introduced in the methods section (page 3) as a way to link this through?

4. Page 9, Discussion: The last para introduces the time commitment related to the questionnaires. This finding isn't presented in the results but could go in the Feasibility Results section on page 7.

5. Page 10: Consider combining the two stand alone sentences into a paragraph on study measures ("We learned that..." and "The Social Support Questionnaire...")

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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