Reviewer’s report

Title: Patterns of physical co-/multi-morbidity among patients with serious mental illness: a population-based cross-sectional study

Version: 1 Date: 5 February 2014

Reviewer: Daniel Smith

Reviewer’s report:

This is a clearly written paper which makes use of a primary care dataset from a defined area in London (Lambeth). The statistical approach is appropriate and overall the results are of interest. I have a few points for the authors to consider:

1. It looks like the physical health conditions were selected based on QoF reporting (rather than Read Codes) or some other analysis of routine primary care data? To some extent, this might explain some of the differences found in this study compared to our study (Smith et al, 2013, BMJOpen). It would be good for the authors to address this point more fully in their discussion. For example, could the fact that the QoF is incentivised have affected recording for certain conditions?

2. Could the authors state the 5 conditions covered by QoF but which were not available for this study (and why)?

3. The prevalence of diabetes in SMI patients of 12.9% is interesting because it is higher than in many other studies (usually about 8%). Again, could this be something to do with the QoF? Clearly ethnicity could play a role but the OR for diabetes in SMI versus non-SMI remained significant even in the fully adjusted model.

4. The LDN database also has prescribing information. It would be of interest to see how adding antipsychotic medication to the models might influence the results, eg, with respect to diabetes.

5. The main aim of this paper was to compare patterns of multimorbidity between SMI versus non-SMI. The authors acknowledge that they only had 12 conditions available, so it might be more accurate to say that, from the 12 conditions they were able to study, the overall pattern of multimorbidity was similar between SMI and non-SMI.

6. Very minor point: Table 4 is missing the note for what the fully adjusted model (2) includes.

7. Another minor point is that these data are from a very specific locality (Lambeth) – perhaps Lambeth should be in the title rather than ‘population-based’.
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