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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed in this manuscript an interesting and evolving aspect of mental health research. Of particular interest is the theoretical background on research methodologies in network research, and the application to the Chinese context is noteworthy.

The Abstract is clear and well written.

The Background section describes the genesis of collaborative research in mental health and the provides sufficient and interesting perspective on research collaboration as a function of economic expansion. However, the description of the various concepts (types and degrees of connectness and centrality) and research methodologies requires more detailed explanation as most clinicians are unfamiliar with these constructs.

The manuscript would benefit from re-organisation of the material. For example, the description in the Methods section of social network analysis (SNA) and the related theoretical constructs could be moved to the Background section with the Methods section reserved for more detailed description of SNA application to the data. The first several sentences under the various "Analysis on collaboration..." subheadings are more appropriate under Methods, with the Results section focusing on findings.

Similarly, some of the text under Discussion would be more appropriate under Results.

The reference list is complete

Figure 2 is illegible in its current form.
Figures 3 and 4 are interesting but dense and largely illegible.

Finally, there are several typographical errors throughout the manuscript that require attention and correction.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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