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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Authors

The engagement of young people is an area of great interest to those working in youth mental health particularly. Your paper is well-written and challenges our notion of what it means to actually involve young people in decision making with regard to their mental health.

There are several issues, however, which I feel would improve the paper somewhat:

Overall, I think that the paper requires more justification of why this technique was used. You do not provide many references demonstrating why and how other techniques do not work and the rationale for why and in what specific ways the present technique is better.

L 68 - give a brief explanation of what the ladder consists of

L 88 - 'risk leading to resilience' - please explain what you mean by this

L112 - Who were the young people you engaged with, what were their ages, gender and how did you recruit them? How representative were they of 'young people'?

L166 - why only one parent? How were they selected? Were they related to one of the young people involved? And why were they not physically present in the sessions?

L170 - were the sessions recorded? Do you think that this would have been useful/detrimental?

L184 - what are your thoughts on getting one of the young people to facilitate the sessions? Would this have been useful? Are there any examples of people using this technique?

L235 - First paragraph of discussion does not read well - would rewrite

L 285 - 'experts by experience'

L 289 - can you provide an example of this?
L295 - do these really work? From my experience, young people (and adults) find them extremely annoying!

L315 - did you conduct follow-up with all of the young people who were involved - if so, what were the overall opinions?
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