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Dear Editorial team,

Re: MS: 2101687356104357 - Enhanced Physical Health Screening for People with Severe Mental Illness in Hong Kong Daniel Bressington, Jolene Mui, Sabina Hulbert, Eric Cheung, Stephen Bradford and Richard Gray

Many thanks for the useful reviewers’ comments for our manuscript. We believe that we have now addressed these to improve the overall quality of the paper. Each individual comment and our responses are detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Abstract:**  
Line 1 - change 'than' 'to compared to'  
line 3 abstract - add 'the' after demonstrated | All changed |
| **p6 recruitment & selection:**  
Line 2 - add 'in' after trained; add 'how' after “and”  
Line 6 - change 'that' to 'who'  
Line 7 - add 'service users' after 5 | All changed  
Added: “patients” rather than “service users” for consistency. |
| **Inclusion criteria:**  
Line 1- add years to 18-65. | Added “years” |
| **p 7 Data collection:**  
Line 9 of 1st parag - is BMI figures of male & female respectively or is this a range? | These are different cut-off points to define obesity for different ethnic populations. We have added a short explanation of each in brackets in order to improve clarity for the reader. |
| **p9 Prescribed medication at baseline** - change to medications | Changed to “medications” |
| **p10 Cardiovascular risk measurements:**  
Line 5 change 'have' to 'were' | Changed to “were” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>p11 Patient's health behaviours:</strong></th>
<th>All changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 3 change 'have' to had Line 7 - change 'is' to was.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>p12 Discussion:</strong></th>
<th>All changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>line 5 - change 'were' to are line 11 - change 'than' to compared to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **p13** | |
| Line 10 - change 'that' to who. | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>p7 Data collection:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful to include an appendix with the 27 items used as indicators of health risk.</td>
<td>I have included a list of the HIP items as figure 1. I have therefore changed the numbering of the original figure 1 to figure 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>p17. Line 3-4.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This statement needs expansion. How does the author know that the enhanced screening programme did not positively impact on other areas of patients' physical well-being? | Agreed - This has been changed from “physical well-being” to: “cardiovascular risk factors” because other areas of physical health well-being were not investigated in this study. I think we can assert with some confidence that: “In this instance the enhanced screening programme does not seem to have significantly improved patients’ cardiovascular risk factors, but may have resulted in the prevention of further health deterioration”.

1. On the last paragraph of background the following sentence needs a reference: The authors of the HIP state that the measure should be used as a tool for eliciting positive change... | A reference has been added to support this. |

2. The reliability and validity figures for the HIP should be added or at least commended if they do not exist. | The following sentence has been added within the data collection section: “Data relating to the psychometric properties of the HIP have not been established/reported; however the face validity, patient acceptability and clinical utility have been demonstrated in a UK population of SMI patients [19, 20].” |

3. Could you please refer to the tables regarding the 27 HIP-items? Or describe the items more in the method part. The paper would be easier to understand if the reader was able to see which the HIP items are. | I have added an additional figure which details the items included in the HIP. |

4. In secondary analysis, clarify which the five BMI categories were. | These categories have been added. |
5. In tables 2-5; what is the reason for p-values having 3 decimals especially when there are no significant differences? One decimal or maybe two is enough if you don’t want to just write NS (non-significant).

All decimal points are now reduced to 2 (within all tables and within the main text).

6. In discussion, in the end of the first paragraph; you write that ..“number of other studies conducted in different countries..” but you have only one reference. Add some more refs to support your statement.

Additional references have been provided to support this comment.

**Minor essential revisions**

1. Use capital letters for the screening tool to match your abbreviation: health improvement profile (HIP).

This has been corrected.

2. In methods: check the level of headings regarding Incl and Excl criteria. I think these should belong under the heading Recruitment and selection.

These criteria are now under the “recruitment and selection” heading.

3. Figure 1, the last box; check the text in this box. It cannot be seen totally in the pdf file but I believe there is something missing.

I have moved this box so that it is easier to format.

**Editors additional comments:**

Please include a full title page with the authors' affiliations clearly stated.

A full title page is now included in the submission.

---

Many thanks again for all of the help and support throughout this process. I look forward to receiving further advice.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Daniel Bressington (on behalf on the research team).