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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The aim of the study is clear and highly relevant

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Offhand, yes, and the data is quite unique. The protocol for this case register has been described in earlier publications, which is reassuring. On the other hand, it is difficult to see through this complex registration system, and I really miss data about cause of death.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes, but it is well known that people with SMI as defined in this article have substantially higher than expected mortality in all age groups. In that sense this article doesn’t contribute new knowledge but it does confirm existing knowledge.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
I would recommend dividing the “results and discussion” section into two different sections.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
No. There is a lack of substantiation in the discussion. The authors do have a lot of ideas about how their findings could be explained but without references to relevant studies and without any further in-depth analyses. I need a more detailed analysis of the results related to relevant studies. Again I miss data about cause of death. OBS! Major Compulsory Revisions

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, but I don’t like the sentence “We were able to draw on a large numbers of case records from what, we believe, is the largest single provider of secondary mental healthcare in Europe”. Either they are the largest single provider or they are not.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes it seems to.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes and no. For example I find the sentence in the abstract “Despite recent improvements of health care systems, there has been little evidence for benefits on life expectancy in people with SMI” highly interesting. I was looking forward to reading more about that dilemma, but was quite disappointed. I don’t think that sentence belong to the abstract.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Offhand, yes, but as a reviewer, whose first language is not English, I am not the right person to ask.

An article of limited interest: OBS! But it could be improved.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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