

Reviewer Comments-2

Strengths:

The paper addresses a significant public health issue, suicide prevention, and effectively positions podcasts as an innovative dissemination tool. In the Literature Review, the discussion of podcast growth, mental health applications, and audience engagement is well-researched and supported with academic sources. The paper follows a clear and logical flow, beginning with historical context, progressing to specific benefits of podcasts, and concluding with limitations and future considerations. An attempt is made to Emphasis on Evidence-Based Impact where the inclusion of effectiveness measures, both perceived and actual, strengthens the argument that podcasts can be a valuable tool for mental health education.

Areas for Improvement:

Abstract -The abstract is too general and does not clearly present key findings or implications of the podcast's impact. Consider summarizing concrete results, such as audience reach, effectiveness, or engagement metrics which needs more specificity.

Introduction - While the introduction sets up the topic well, it lacks a clear research gap as justification. The paper should explicitly state: *Why is this research needed? What specific gap does Brain Hijack fill compared to existing mental health podcasts?*

Podcast Formation Section – The process of selecting the title is described in detail, but there is little explanation for *why* "Brain Hijack" was ultimately chosen beyond it capturing attention. Does the name align with public health messaging or suicide prevention strategies?

Review of Scientific Literature – The literature review presents useful data, but it is largely descriptive rather than critical. Some areas lack synthesis—how do these studies relate to each other? Example: The discussion on mental health podcast listeners lacks nuance. While it states that people with lower education benefit the most, it does not explore *why* or what this means for podcast design. The paper acknowledges a lack of research on long-term podcast effectiveness but does not propose potential methodologies for future studies. What measures could be implemented to track sustained impact? While the paper discusses the impact of *Brain Hijack*, it does not present original data (e.g., listener feedback, audience engagement metrics, or knowledge retention surveys). Incorporating qualitative or quantitative data would significantly strengthen the study's claims.

Limitations Section – Needs a Stronger Critical Lens

While it highlights the lack of research on suicide-related podcasts, it does not critique potential ethical concerns or challenges in discussing suicide prevention via podcasts. Example: *Could podcasts inadvertently trigger vulnerable individuals? Are there risks in presenting suicide prevention in an informal format?*

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Critically analyze how studies relate rather than simply summarizing them. Address long-term effectiveness with potential research strategies. Incorporate original data (if available) on Brain Hijack's reach and impact. Critically examine potential risks of using podcasts for suicide prevention.
- The description of the review process is thorough, but it may help to briefly outline the specific roles of each organization (e.g., what MHNRN specializes in vs. what CSTS focuses on).
 - Ensure consistency in terminology like in some places, the description alternates between "Brain Hijack team" and "SPC" or "CSTS colleagues." Keeping the language consistent would help clarity.

Results Section Expansion: The descriptions of Figures 1–5 provide a solid overview, but more direct explanation of key takeaways from the figures would strengthen the section. For example, for Figure 3, explicitly stating how many myths were addressed or providing examples of specific myths covered in the podcast could be helpful. The results mention that Brain Hijack did not cover "Strengthen Economic Supports." It may be helpful to briefly explain why this pillar was missing or if there are future plans to include it.

Disclaimer: I do not have any special interest on the topic nor bias against the issue addressed