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Reviewer's report:

I appreciated the opportunity to peer-review this most valuable research on this vulnerable population with complex health profile - both mental disorders and physical co-morbidities.

The introduction leading to the identification in the gap in knowledge and the aims of the study was succinct, yet informative. I appreciated the reference to other international studies.

Research methods. In my opinion, the research method chosen, including the statistical analysis were appropriate in addressing the aims of the study. The sample size was large. The investigators took valid measures in identifying the target - the ID population.

Results: The results were described appropriately without too much repetition of the information in Table 1. In Figure 1, it would have been helpful to label the y - axis. On the last page of the manuscript, "Figure 1" should be corrected to state "Figure 2".

Discussion. I found the discussion very comprehensive in explaining the study findings in comparison with other research studies.

References. These were appropriate albeit almost 40% were older than a decade.
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