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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has improved - it is a shame that the authors do not think that sensitivity analyses are warranted.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Table 2 proportions. Are we to read 76/84 in the control group of the Appleby study had a diagnosis vs. 17/64 in the control group? Why not have one column with the information presented as above for the control group and one column for the suicide group?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It would be good if percentages could be presented alongside the proportion information in table 2.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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