Patterns of preventable death and government response compliance across Australian coronial jurisdictions: a natural language processing analysis of 9833 findings

Hayden Farquhar, MBBS MPHTM

Independent researcher (no institutional affiliation)

ORCID: 0009-0002-6226-440X

Corresponding author: Hayden Farquhar, hayden.farquhar@icloud.com

---

Abstract

Objectives: To quantify patterns of preventable death in Australian coronial findings, measure government compliance with coroner recommendations across jurisdictions, and identify case characteristics associated with recommendation issuance and acceptance.

Design: Cross-sectional computational text analysis of publicly available coronial findings using unsupervised topic modelling and rule-based classification.

Setting: Australian coronial system, all eight state and territory jurisdictions, findings published on the Australasian Legal Information Institute (AustLII) database, 2000–2024.

Participants: 9833 coronial findings and 2040 linked government responses.

Main outcome measures: Death-type topic prevalence, recommendation rate by jurisdiction, government response acceptance rate.

Results: Twenty-six death-type topics were identified, with medical/surgical deaths (12.5%), mental health (10.4%), and deaths in custody (8.6%) most prevalent. Overall, 45.6% of published findings contained formal recommendations (95% CI, 44.6–46.5%). Of 2040 government responses, 43.0% were unclassifiable (predominantly Victorian administrative cover letters). Among classifiable responses, 53.2% were accepted (implemented, already implemented, or partially accepted), ranging from 26.0% (Western Australia) to 88.0% (Queensland). Multivariable logistic regression showed that jurisdiction was the strongest measured predictor of acceptance (pseudo R^2 0.13 vs 0.14 with all covariates), though most variance remained unexplained. Among published findings, Indigenous Australians were represented in 10.1% (2.7 times the 3.8% population share).[12] Findings involving medication errors had the highest recommendation rate (55.1%) but among the lowest acceptance rates (26.4%).

Conclusions: Among publicly available coronial findings, fewer than half contain formal recommendations. Government acceptance is low and structurally determined by jurisdiction rather than case characteristics, suggesting that legislative reform is needed to improve the system's preventive effectiveness.

Introduction

Australian coroners investigate reportable deaths – deaths that must be notified to a coroner by law, including deaths in custody, deaths during or following medical procedures, and unexpected, unnatural, or violent deaths – with a statutory mandate to identify circumstances that may contribute to preventing future deaths.[1] In all jurisdictions, coroners may make recommendations to government agencies, organisations, or individuals, but these recommendations are non-binding in most states and territories.[2] Only Victoria and Queensland have legislated mandatory government response mechanisms.[3,4]

Despite the coronial system's importance for public health surveillance,[19,25] systematic evidence on its preventive effectiveness is limited.[18] The National Coronial Information System (NCIS) provides coded mortality data but does not capture the full text of findings or the content of government responses.[5] Previous compliance studies have been confined to single jurisdictions, predominantly Victoria, using manual review of at most 282 recommendation–response pairs,[6,7] and have documented persistent challenges in translating recommendations into policy change.[17] Computational text analysis has been applied to death investigation data internationally,[15,16] but the only published NLP study of Australian coronial text used supervised classification to identify suicide-related findings and was limited to 4459 documents from a single jurisdiction.[8]

The AustLII Coronial Law Library provides open access to the full text of coronial findings and government responses from all Australian jurisdictions.[9] This resource enables national-level computational analysis of the coronial system for the first time – spanning all eight jurisdictions, all death types, and all publicly available government responses.

We aimed to: (1) identify thematic patterns in coronial findings using unsupervised topic mod-

elling; (2) measure recommendation and government compliance rates across all jurisdictions; and (3) examine patterns in Indigenous deaths, medication-related deaths, and deaths in institutional settings.

Methods

Data source and corpus construction

We scraped the AustLII Coronial Law Library – the largest open-access repository of Australian coronial findings – comprising 67 sub-databases across all eight state and territory jurisdictions. AustLII publishes findings at the discretion of individual courts; the corpus is therefore likely enriched for cases involving recommendations, formal inquests, and matters of public interest, and does not represent all reportable deaths. An automated pipeline enumerated case URLs, downloaded documents (HTML and PDF), and extracted text using pdfplumber with Tesseract OCR fallback for image-based PDFs. Of 9924 findings enumerated, 9833 were usable after excluding 37 short (<200 characters) and 54 empty documents. We also extracted 2043 government responses from seven jurisdictions (ACT has no response database); after quality filtering, 2040 were retained for analysis. Text cleaning included section detection, recommendation extraction, and removal of 697 domain-specific stopwords.

Topic modelling

We applied BERTopic[10] with term frequency–inverse document frequency (TF-IDF) embeddings (5000 features) rather than neural sentence embeddings. Standard sentence-transformer models (256-token context) captured only court headers in these long legal documents (median 18 240–42 537 characters), producing jurisdiction-based rather than thematic clusters. Even sparse-attention models such as Longformer (4096 tokens) still substantially truncate long legal documents,[31] and TF-IDF representations have demonstrated competitive or superior performance to transformers on long legal text classification tasks.[32] Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP)[20] reduced dimensionality to five components, and Hierarchical Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise (HDBSCAN)[21] identified clusters. Topics representing the same death type but split by jurisdiction were manually merged based on shared top terms and representative document content (e.g., separate NSW and VIC custody topics merged into "Deaths in Custody"), yielding 26 final topics. Model quality was assessed by normalised pointwise mutual information (NPMI) coherence[22] (mean 0.29) and topic diversity (0.77).

Compliance analysis

Government responses were linked to their corresponding findings using case reference numbers or deceased names (jurisdiction-specific methods; match rates 65.6–100%). A rule-based regex classifier assigned each response to one of seven outcome categories: implemented, already implemented, partially accepted, under consideration, noted, not supported, or unclassifiable. Victorian responses were predominantly unclassifiable (78.6%) because 619 of 788 were administrative cover letters confirming receipt without substantive engagement with the recommendations.

Special analyses

Layered regular expression flags identified Indigenous deaths (three definitions tested in sensitivity analysis), medication-related patterns (opioids, psychiatric medications, medication errors, polypharmacy), and facility-specific deaths (hospitals, psychiatric facilities, prisons, aged care, police custody). These were cross-tabulated with topic assignments and compliance outcomes.

Statistical analysis

We used chi-square tests with Cramer's V for effect sizes, odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals (Wald method), Wilson score confidence intervals for proportions, and multivariable logistic regression controlling for jurisdiction, year, and text length.[11] Recommendation models (Models 1–2) used N = 7786 findings after excluding 2046 topic model outliers and one case with missing year. Acceptance models (Models 3–4) used N = 842 classifiable linked responses after excluding unclassifiable responses, unlinked responses (primarily 234 unmatched NSW cases), and cases with incomplete covariates. Benjamini–Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) correction[23] was applied to all 41 statistical tests; 27 survived correction. Sensitivity analyses tested three definitions of Indigenous case identification.

Ethics

All data were publicly available on AustLII. No ethics approval was required. Indigenous analysis focuses on systemic patterns; facility data are aggregated to type level.

Results

Corpus characteristics

The corpus comprised 9833 findings from eight jurisdictions spanning 2000–2024 (with sparse coverage extending to 1979 for NSW and 1981 for NT), encompassing all categories of reportable death (not limited to those where the coroner concluded the death was preventable) (Table 1). Victoria contributed the most findings (4326, 44.0%) and Western Australia had the longest median text (42 537 characters). Overall, 4479 findings (45.6%; 95% CI, 44.6–46.5%) contained formal recommendations.

Recommendation rates varied substantially by jurisdiction: South Australia had the highest rate (70.1%), followed by Tasmania (56.2%) and Queensland (54.6%), while Western Australia had the lowest (28.9%) and Victoria the second lowest (38.4%).

Topic model

Twenty-six topics were identified spanning the full range of coronial casework (Table 2). The three largest topics were medical/surgical deaths (1231 findings, 12.5%), mental health/psychiatric deaths (1024, 10.4%), and deaths in custody (841, 8.6%). Topic–jurisdiction associations were strong: deaths in custody concentrated in the Northern Territory and Western Australia, bushfire/natural disaster deaths in Victoria, and child deaths/protection in Tasmania and New South Wales.

Government compliance

Of 2040 government responses linked to findings, 460 (22.5%) indicated that recommendations had been implemented, 138 (6.8%) were partially accepted, 377 (18.4%) remained under consideration, and 48 (2.3%) were not supported (Table 3). A total of 877 responses (43.0%) were unclassifiable, predominantly Victorian administrative cover letters lacking substantive engagement with the recommendations.

Among classifiable responses, acceptance rates (implemented, already implemented, or partially accepted) ranged from 26.0% (Western Australia) to 88.0% (Queensland) (Table 3). Queensland's acceptance rate was substantially higher than all other jurisdictions (OR v NSW, 10.8; 95% CI, 6.4–18.3). Acceptance showed a modest improving temporal trend (OR 1.07 per year; 95% CI, 1.03–1.12; $p = 0.002$).

Of the 2040 responses, 1800 (88.2%) were successfully linked to their corresponding findings; the remaining 240 (primarily 234 unmatched NSW cases) could not be linked. After further excluding 877 unclassifiable and 81 responses with incomplete covariates, 842 classifiable linked responses were available for regression analysis. Multivariable logistic regression confirmed that jurisdiction was the strongest measured predictor of acceptance (Model 3 pseudo $R^2 = 0.13$). Adding case-level covariates (text length, Indigenous status, medication flags, facility type) provided minimal improvement (Model 4 pseudo $R^2 = 0.14$), and no case-level covariate remained significant after FDR correction.

Indigenous deaths

Indigenous Australians were identified in 993 findings (10.1%; 95% CI, 9.5–10.7%), approximately 2.7 times the 3.8% population share.[12] Concentration was highest in the Northern Territory (67.5% of findings) and Western Australia (24.3%). Indigenous cases had a higher recommendation rate than non-Indigenous cases (54.2% v 44.6%; OR 1.47; 95% CI, 1.29–1.68). Government acceptance was also higher for Indigenous cases (51.3% v 26.4%; OR 3.02; 95% CI, 2.22–4.11), possibly reflecting heightened scrutiny following the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. Sensitivity analysis confirmed these findings were stable across narrow, medium, and broad definitions of Indigenous identification (OR 1.46–1.47 for recommendations).

Medication and facility patterns

Medication errors were flagged in 1178 findings (12.0%) and were associated with the highest recommendation rate (55.1%; 95% CI, 52.2–57.9%) but among the lowest acceptance rates (26.4%; 95% CI, 21.3–32.3%). Polypharmacy cases (4.4% prevalence) showed a similar pattern: high recommendation rate (56.5%) and the lowest acceptance (23.2%), though this estimate is based on a small number of classifiable responses and should be interpreted with caution.

Prison/correctional settings were associated with 1818 findings (18.5%) and had the highest acceptance rate among facility types (41.8%; OR 2.09; 95% CI, 1.62–2.70). Psychiatric facilities (12.4% prevalence) had an above-average recommendation rate (53.3%) but acceptance did not significantly differ from the overall rate.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first computational analysis of coronial findings and government responses spanning all eight Australian jurisdictions. The analysis of 9833 publicly available findings and 2040 government responses documents systematic patterns in how coroners use their preventive powers and how governments respond.

Among published findings, 45.6% contained formal recommendations, with substantial jurisdictional variation (28.9–70.1%). Because AustLII disproportionately publishes inquest findings and cases of public interest, this rate likely overstates the proportion of all reportable deaths that attract recommendations. Nonetheless, the wide jurisdictional range indicates that structural and cultural factors shape whether coroners use their preventive powers, as previously noted for specific death types[24,30] but here shown to extend across all casework.

Government acceptance of recommendations was low and overwhelmingly determined by jurisdiction. Among classifiable responses, Queensland's 88.0% acceptance rate was more than three times Western Australia's 26.0%. Adding case-level covariates to a jurisdiction-only model improved pseudo R^2 from 0.13 to 0.14, and no case-level covariate survived FDR correction — jurisdiction is the strongest measured predictor, though most variance in acceptance remains unexplained (the full model AIC was 1027 vs 1020 for the jurisdiction-only model; eTable 1). This extends previous single-jurisdiction analyses[6,7] and confirms that recommendations are frequently "lost in translation" between coroner and government,[17] aligning with Queensland's Coroners Act 2003 requirement for written responses within specified timeframes.[4] International evidence suggests such jurisdictional heterogeneity is not unique to Australia.[27] Victoria illustrates a particular failure mode: despite mandatory responses since 2008 and the coroner's recognised public health role,[28] 78.6%

of Victorian responses were administrative cover letters acknowledging receipt without engaging with the substance of recommendations. Sensitivity analysis reclassifying these as "noted" places Victoria's acceptance rate at 10.9%, the lowest of any jurisdiction (eTable 10). Mandatory response legislation is necessary but insufficient without prescribed standards requiring responses to address each recommendation individually with specified timeframes.

Medication errors showed the widest gap between recommendation rates (55.1%, the highest of any category) and acceptance rates (26.4%, among the lowest), echoing patterns found in hospital-specific coronial reviews.[29] Polypharmacy cases showed a similar pattern (56.5% recommendation rate, 23.2% acceptance), though the latter estimate rests on a small number of classifiable responses and should be interpreted cautiously. Medication safety recommendations are frequently directed at private clinicians, professional colleges, or pharmaceutical regulators — entities over which coronial recommendations carry moral but not legal authority.[1,28] By contrast, prison-related recommendations had the highest acceptance rate (41.8%; OR 2.09; 95% CI, 1.62–2.70), likely reflecting the direct institutional accountability of government-operated corrective services. The coronial system's preventive influence appears strongest when recommendations target government-controlled institutions, with markedly lower acceptance when directed at fragmented private healthcare systems.

The higher unadjusted acceptance rate for Indigenous cases (OR 3.02) is confounded by jurisdictional composition rather than reflecting differential treatment: Indigenous cases are concentrated in the Northern Territory (67.5% of NT findings) and Queensland — jurisdictions with higher baseline compliance — while Victoria (contributing the most unclassifiable responses) has few Indigenous cases. In the full multivariable model (adjusting for jurisdiction, year, text length, and case-level

flags), the Indigenous coefficient was not statistically significant (OR 1.39; 95% CI, 0.90–2.17; p = 0.14; eTable 1), confirming that the unadjusted association is driven by jurisdictional confounding rather than differential treatment of Indigenous cases. More informative is the polarised pattern of government response (eTable 10): among Indigenous cases, "implemented" accounted for 37.8% and "partially accepted" for 10.4%, compared with 19.9% and 5.9% for non-Indigenous, but "not supported" was also more than double the non-Indigenous rate (4.1% v 1.7%). Indigenous deaths appear to provoke substantive engagement — agencies respond more concretely but are also more willing to explicitly reject recommendations. Whether this polarisation reflects differential treatment of Indigenous cases specifically, or is characteristic of how NT and QLD respond to all recommendations, cannot be determined from these data. The sustained scrutiny following the 1991 Royal Commission[13] may create political pressure to respond,[14] but whether this engagement translates to substantive reform requires further investigation, particularly given that "accepted" as classified here reflects stated intent rather than verified implementation.

Limitations

This study has limitations that affect interpretation. The AustLII corpus represents publicly available findings, not all reportable deaths. In several jurisdictions, findings are preferentially published when they contain recommendations or are of significant public interest; non-inquest (chambers) findings are rarely published. Recommendation rates and topic distributions therefore characterise the public record of the coronial system, which is biased toward more complex and systemic cases,[26] and should not be interpreted as population-level estimates. The corpus may also be incomplete for some jurisdictions and years, with known upload lag for recent findings.

The regex-based compliance classifier was not validated against manual human coding, which is a significant limitation. Any misclassification is likely to inflate acceptance rates: the classifier treats bureaucratic language such as "agreed" or "supported in principle" as equivalent to "implemented", and cannot distinguish stated intent from verified action. The true acceptance rate is therefore probably lower than the 53.2% reported here, though the magnitude of this overestimation was not quantified. Previous Australian compliance research has documented that government "acceptance" of coronial recommendations often does not translate into changed practice,[6,7] a problem our classification cannot address. NSW's lower match rate (65.6%) means 234 responses could not be linked to findings; topic and year distributions were similar between matched and unmatched cases, supporting the assumption that missingness is approximately random. Victoria's 78.6% unclassifiable rate limits comparison for that state, though sensitivity analyses confirmed robustness (eTable 10). The "police custody" regex flag had weak alignment with expected topics (12.6% in expected topics; HHI 0.082; eTable 5), reflecting that police contact is mentioned across many death types rather than concentrating in a single topic — results involving this flag should be interpreted accordingly. Flagged cases were systematically longer than unflagged cases (median length ratio up to 2.18); this was controlled for in regression models but may affect prevalence estimates. The absence of NCIS-coded validation data represents a further limitation.

Conclusions

Among publicly available Australian coronial findings, fewer than half contain formal recommendations, and government acceptance is low and primarily determined by jurisdictional legislative frameworks rather than case characteristics. Queensland's mandatory, timeframe-specified

response model is associated with the highest compliance, while Victoria's mandatory but unstructured mechanism produces predominantly uninformative administrative responses. Medication-related deaths show the widest gap between recommendation rates and acceptance, pointing to structural barriers when recommendations target entities outside direct government control. Computational analysis of open coronial data offers a scalable, reproducible approach to monitoring the system's preventive effectiveness.

Tables

Table 1. Corpus characteristics by jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Findings	Years	Median text (chars)	With recommendations	Rec rate (%)
NSW	1071	1979–2026	37 549	435	40.6
VIC	4326	2002–2025	18 240	1663	38.4
QLD	1035	2004–2026	42 537	565	54.6
WA	705	2012–2025	41 845	204	28.9
SA	884	2000–2025	19 115	620	70.1
TAS	1304	2001–2026	9960	733	56.2
ACT	96	2013–2025	23 801	42	43.8
NT	412	1981–2026	33 409	217	52.7
Total	**9833**			**4479**	**45.6**

Years reflect AustLII's publication numbering, not the date of death or inquest. Findings published

in early 2026 (n = 21) relate to deaths investigated in prior years.

Table 2. Topic model: 26 death-type topics identified from 9833 coronial findings

Topic	Count	%
Medical / Surgical	1231	12.5
Mental Health / Psychiatric	1024	10.4
Deaths in Custody	841	8.6
Disability / Aged Care	721	7.3
Missing Persons / Homicide	462	4.7
Drowning / Water	440	4.5
Child Deaths / Protection	381	3.9
Drug-Related Deaths	369	3.8
Motor Vehicle Crashes	335	3.4
Bushfire / Natural Disaster	292	3.0
Police Use of Force / Siege	231	2.3
Police Pursuits	202	2.1
Family Violence	155	1.6
Perinatal / Obstetric	148	1.5
Cyclist / Pedestrian	134	1.4
Heavy Vehicle / Truck	131	1.3
Aviation	98	1.0
Restraint / Excited Delirium	90	0.9
House Fire / Smoke Alarm	87	0.9
TAS Formulaic Findings	76	0.8
VIC Royal Commission Cases	69	0.7
Deaths in Police Custody	60	0.6

Topic	Count	%
Rail Crossings	54	0.5
Homicide Investigation	54	0.5
Seatbelt / Occupant Safety	50	0.5
Emergency Dispatch / Asthma	50	0.5
Outliers	*2046*	*20.8*

BERTopic with TF-IDF embeddings, UMAP dimensionality reduction, and HDBSCAN clustering. Mean NPMI coherence = 0.29; topic diversity = 0.77.

Table 3. Government response outcomes by jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Responses	Implemented	Partially accepted	Under considera-tion	Noted	Not supported	Unclassifiable	Acceptance rate[a] (%)
NSW	681	184	54	194	43	24	174	48.5
VIC	788	41	37	43	35	5	619	50.9
QLD	209	165	19	9	1	15	0	88.0
WA	195	31	7	80	32	2	41	26.0
SA	87	25	13	31	3	0	13	54.1
TAS	58	9	2	13	4	0	30	39.3
NT	22	5	6	7	1	2	0	54.5
Total	**2040**	**460**	**138**	**377**	**119**	**48**	**877**	**53.2**

[a] Acceptance rate = (implemented + already implemented + partially accepted) / classifiable responses. "Already implemented" (n = 21; NSW 8, VIC 8, WA 2, SA 2, NT 1) is included in the

acceptance numerator but omitted as a separate column for space. Classifiable = total minus unclassifiable.

Figures

Figure 1. Compliance outcomes by jurisdiction



Heatmap showing the distribution of government response outcomes (implemented, partially accepted, under consideration, noted, not supported, unclassifiable) across seven jurisdictions with response databases.

Figure 2. Indigenous death prevalence by jurisdiction



Bar chart showing the proportion of coronial findings involving Indigenous Australians in each jurisdiction, ranging from 1.3% (Tasmania) to 67.5% (Northern Territory).

Figure 3. Odds ratio forest plot: case characteristics and outcomes



Forest plot showing unadjusted odds ratios for the association between case characteristic flags (Indigenous, medication, facility types) and two outcomes: (a) having recommendations and (b) government acceptance.

Declarations

Funding

None.

Competing interests

None declared.

Data availability

The underlying coronial findings are publicly available on the Australasian Legal Information Institute (AustLII) Coronial Law Library (https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/special/coronial/). AustLII's terms of use do not permit bulk redistribution. All analysis code, derived output tables, and figures are available at https://github.com/hayden-farquhar/Coronial-NLP-Analysis.

Code availability

All code is available at https://github.com/hayden-farquhar/Coronial-NLP-Analysis, including scraping scripts, preprocessing pipeline, topic modelling notebooks, compliance classification, and statistical analyses.

Ethics approval

All data were publicly available on AustLII. No ethics approval was required. Indigenous analysis focuses on systemic patterns; facility data are aggregated to type level.

Author contributions

HF conceived and designed the study, developed the scraping and NLP pipeline, performed all analyses, and drafted the manuscript.

References

1. Freckelton I, Ranson D. *Death Investigation and the Coroner's Inquest*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2006.
2. Watterson R, Brown P, McKenzie J. Coronial recommendations and the prevention of Indigenous death. *Aust Indig Law Rev* 2008; 12(2): 4–26.
3. Coroners Act 2008 (Vic), s 72(3)–(5).
4. Coroners Act 2003 (Qld), s 46A.
5. Saar E, Bugeja L, Engel A. The National Coronial Information System: harnessing data for prevention. *Acad Forensic Pathol* 2017; 7(4): 560–575.
6. Bugeja L, Ibrahim JE, Ozanne-Smith J, Brodie LR. Compliance with safety recommendations arising from coronial inquests: a study of 282 cases in Victoria, Australia. *BMC Public Health* 2014; 14: 1244.
7. Sutherland G, Kemp C, Bugeja L, et al. What happens to coroners' recommendations for improving public health and safety? Organisational responses to coronial recommendations in Victoria, Australia. *Aust N Z J Public Health* 2016; 40(5): 451–456.
8. Carpenter B, Tomsen S, Welch D. Automating coronial text analysis: applying natural lan-

guage processing to Australian coronial data. *Research Square* 2021 [preprint; not peer-reviewed as of February 2026]. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-841291/v1.

9. Chung J, Butler D, Greenleaf G. The AustLII Coronial Law Library: a comprehensive resource for coronial law. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 2023. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4458910.
10. Grootendorst M. BERTopic: neural topic modeling with a class-based TF-IDF procedure. *arXiv* 2022; 2203.05794.
11. Wilson EB. Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *J Am Stat Assoc* 1927; 22(158): 209–212.
12. Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Estimates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, June 2021*. Canberra: ABS, 2022.
13. Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. *National Report*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1991.
14. Walsh T, Counter A. Deaths in custody in Australia: a quantitative analysis of coronial data. *Curr Issues Crim Justice* 2019; 31(2): 143–163.
15. Arseniev-Koehler A, Mooney SJ, Engel L, et al. Machine learning of language use patterns to measure harmful alcohol use in the National Violent Death Reporting System. *PNAS* 2022; 119(2): e2110215119.
16. Zhang L, Richards DB. Automated extraction and analysis of prevention of future deaths reports. *J R Soc Med* 2023; 116(5): 176–181.
17. McIntyre J, Mundy T. Lost in translation: the challenges of implementing coronial recommendations for the prevention of death. *Monash Univ Law Rev* 2020; 46(2): 85–118.
18. Bugeja L, Franklin RC, Engel A, et al. Evaluating the impact of coroners' recommendations on reducing injury and death: a systematic review. *J Law Med* 2003; 11: 195–205.

19. Studdert DM, Cordner SM. Impact of coronial investigations on manner and cause of death determinations in Australia, 2000–2007. *Med J Aust* 2010; 192(8): 444–447.

20. McInnes L, Healy J, Melville J. UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv* 2018; 1802.03426.

21. Campello RJGB, Moulavi D, Sander J. Density-based clustering based on hierarchical density estimates. In: *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. Berlin: Springer, 2013: 160–172.

22. Bouma G. Normalized (pointwise) mutual information in collocation extraction. In: *Proceedings of GSCL* 2009: 31–40.

23. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B* 1995; 57(1): 289–300.

24. Moore C, Forrest L. Suicide and coronial inquiries: a cross-jurisdictional analysis of coronial law in Australia. *Psychiatr Psychol Law* 2020; 27(6): 921–937.

25. Milroy CM. A brief history of the coroner in England and colonies. *J Forensic Leg Med* 2019; 62: 46–52.

26. Byard RW, Winskog C. Potential problems arising from the retrospective analysis of coronial data. *J Forensic Leg Med* 2010; 17: 225–229.

27. Luce T, Bugeja L. Death investigation and the coroner's inquest: comparative approaches. *Int J Law Psychiatry* 2013; 36: 166–175.

28. Ranson D. The role of the coroner in public health: the Victorian experience. *Vic Inst Forensic Med* 2010; 28(4): 36–40.

29. Honeybone C. Coroners' recommendations following deaths in hospital: review of published data. *J Forensic Leg Med* 2020; 76: 102069.

30. Butler D, Quince A. Coronial inquests and the promotion of road safety. *J Australas Coll Road Saf* 2015; 26(4): 27–34.

31. Mamakas D, Tsotsi P, Androutsopoulos I, Chalkidis I. Processing long legal documents with pre-trained transformers: modding LegalBERT and Longformer. In: *Proceedings of the Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2022*. Abu Dhabi: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022: 130–142. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.nllp-1.11.

32. Lin Y-C, Chen S-A, Liu J-J, Lin C-J. Linear classifier: an often-forgotten baseline for text classification. In: *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the ACL (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. Toronto: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023: 1876–1888. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.acl-short.160.