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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper. However, a major concern is that since suicide ideation and suicide attempts are two distinct phenomena, the analyses made by combining these two subgroups are a bit confusing.

INTRODUCTION
- OK

METHODS
- Participants and procedure: OK
- Measures: OK
- Data analysis: the name of the statistical software used in analyses must be mentioned in the text.

RESULTS

Socio-demographic trends
- Table 1 is unnecessary and a bit difficult to interpret by general readers. The text reports the changes in the total data, which is OK. Please, remove the table 1 and report statistically significant changes in background characteristic by age-groups in the text.

Comparison of annual prevalence
- Why the authors have chosen the Wilcoxon signed ranks test for comparison of prevalence of suicidal ideation/attempts between Wave 1 and Wave 2? Since the suicide ideation and attempts are measured on the scale yes-no (or is it so, it is not clearly stated in the paper), the more suitable test for comparison of changes between two repeated measures is McNemar’s test.

New serious suicidality and remissions
- Please, use a statistical test for comparing the serious suicidality between male and female patients.

Prediction of serious suicidality
- The variable for “serious suicidality” is a bit confusing. Since suicide ideation and suicide attempts are two distinct phenomena, it would be interesting to see
all analyses made in these subgroups, separately.
- Instead of using a logistic regression model, in which all variables are simultaneously entered to the model, the authors should use a step-wise logistic regression model. At present form of Table 4 is clearly seen that not all variables are estimable when analysed in subgroups according to gender and age.

DISCUSSION
- It is long and, therefore, needs to be condensed. Otherwise, OK.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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