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This is an important and strong paper. The substantive issue is critical, the methodological issue timely, the data sound, and the analyses rigorous. The one weakness is that the authors either fail to see or do not think it important to discuss the ramifications of these results in larger context. The "Big Data" era tends to see institutional data as the "be all and end all" - big, easily available (because it is institutional), nicely fit with existing techniques. The message of this paper has implications that those beyond suicide, beyond the critical army problem, etc. would profit from hearing. Perhaps the authors have plans in another paper or project to do this, but at least a few sentences in the Discussion would be appreciated here in terms of their conclusions about the general import. A minor point: It is only a supplemental table, but that graph is both poor in quality (which just may be a technical issue of printing for this review) and not that informative.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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