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Reviewer's report:

As there is a growing need on health economic research, the authors address a relevant topic in the field of mental health care. Overall, this is a well written manuscript, but I have some suggestions to include into the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Background-section: Several issues concerning the physical health of individuals with mental disorders are described (lifestyle behavior, comorbidity, increased mortality risk). A possible explanation of the poor physical health of individuals with mental disorders is a limited access to somatic health care. Including a paragraph describing this issue appears to be relevant.

2. Methods-section: "Search process" (last paragraph, p. 9). "Full texts of potential matching articles were retrieved and then assessed". How occurred this assessment? Was for example a checklist used?

3. Discussion ("Strengthening the literature" - second paragraph, p. 18). I agree with your comments that there needs to be more investment in better tailoring of programmes and interventions. To my opinion, there also needs to be more investment in teaching mental health nurses how to recognize the potential for prevention or health promotion opportunities, as, based on the results of some (qualitative) studies (e.g. Jormfeldt et al. J. of Psychiatr. Ment. Health Nurs. 2003,10:608) nurses feel sometimes more secure focusing on the mental disorder. Please include some comments on this.

4. Discussion: Considering cost-effectiveness for population sub-groups is in fact an interesting comment as mental disorder patients comprise a broad group (for example diagnosis, in- or outpatients, course of the mental disorder...). This may result in a lack of accurate input data needed in decision-analytic modeling (e.g. disease-specific transition probabilities, utilities). Please include some thoughts on this topic into the Discussion section.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Results-section: "Programmes to reduce smoking, alcohol and substance abuse" (p. 12). Second and third sentence ("There is an extensive..."). I suggest to remove this sentence and include it into the Discussion section.
2. Tables: "Target population": Please add if the target population consisted of in- our outpatients (if available). This is relevant information to me because the setting in which an intervention is provided may influence the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness results (for example: compliance to an exercise program in an inpatient setting may be better as exercise may be integrated into the treatment plan).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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