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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

I started reading this paper with a lot of enthusiasm as a result of the title. My main feeling after going through the manuscript twice is however that the authors promise things in the title and abstract that they do not make true. Most importantly, after reading the manuscript I am left with a feeling of what this paper adds to the literature and what its purpose is. I will try to clarify this point first.

To me, it did not become clear what the authors mean with 'framework' and why depression of CMD's should be added to the Big 4. What does the framework do more than justifying that from a public health perspective, it is important to target diet, smoking, alcohol use, and physical activity as important precedents for poor health? In addition, it did not become clear to me how the authors envision how this 'framework' should be implemented in health care settings. They do refer to some collaborative care interventions, but it did not become clear to me what they actually argue for.

Minor essential revisions

The authors introduce the term CMD's but describe literature that is almost solely focused on depression (and a bit on anxiety). I think they should either restrict to depression or be more thorough in their description of literature, and perhaps be more explicit on a definition of CMD's.

I found the literature references rather sketchy and one-sided. I did not become convinced that this is really the state-of-the-art of what is going on. There are many references to rather obscure journals while more convincing papers exist. There are references to single studies where meta-analyses exist. Perhaps the authors should do a more systematic literature search or present this work as a position paper (and even then I would support a more convincing literature search).

As one of the goals of this paper it was stated that they will provide an overview of the common pathways for CMDs and NCDs, but what they actually describe is a sketchy description of the role of inflammation. This does not do justice to the knowledge base which is far more rich, complex and sometimes contradictory.

The authors state that there have been previous attempts of presenting a
framework. I would be curious to know which they mean and how their approach differs/adds.

Discretionary revisions

There are some errors in the reference list such as a missing year. I would not put a submitted (not accepted paper) in the reference list while stating to which journal it has been submitted. The journal might reject the paper.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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