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Reviewer's report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

 1. None.

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

 1. Pg 3. 8 lines down in 1st paragraph: it’s “The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention” and not “The Center for Disease Control and Prevention.”

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

 1. Pg 6, Inferential statistics section, 2nd sentence…the researchers consider should footnoting the material in parentheses or perhaps rewording the sentence or both.

 2. Pg 7, New serious suicidality and remissions section, 2nd sentence: The authors may wish to consider rewording the sentence so it does not commence with “Three-point-four percent (n=226)…”

 3. Pg 12, 4th line down from top of the page: “Nevertheless, low cell numbers require this interpretation to be viewed cautiously.” and same page, Strengths and limitations section, next to last sentence in the paragraph: “In addition to the survey having restricted age bands, there were three years dividing the data collection points and some categories had small cell size potentially impacting the capacity to detect effects.” Potentially impacting? What was the statistical power?

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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