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Reviewer's report:

This is a significantly improved piece of work that now reads well and it is now clear that it will add to the body of knowledge in this area.

Minor Essential Revisions:

pg 12. typo: I think it should read 'to what extent' not 'to which extent'
pg 13. typo: should it read "However, our data did NOT confirm this’?
pg. 15. the comment that watchful waiting may be appropriate should be referenced

Discretionary Revisions:

There is some minor restructuring that would be beneficial in the discussion section. The discussion should open with the main findings (rather than a restating of the aims which isn't necessary) so as to clearly highlight what the authors have found and contributed the research field. In my mind the main findings are 1. an increased rate of diagnosis suggesting increased rates of recognition (but follow with all your excellent points about what else this might mean, and that the rates are still lower than rates shown in epidemiological studies (ie. simply a matter of moving the last sentence of the first section to the beginning of this section; 2. second section about treatment can remain the same; 3. highlight that there has been an increase in referrals to primary care as your main finding, but then make points about referrals to secondary care still being greater.

A comment: I am not sure that non medically trained readers of the journal will know that lithium is included as the ATC-code N05AN01.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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