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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the Authors:

The current study aimed to determine and predict how people with intellectual disability compare with their age-matched non-disabled peers on measures of psychiatric health care utilization. The authors found that after controlling for age, sex, specialist psychiatric health care utilization in the previous year, and comorbidities, people with intellectual disabilities had a higher psychiatric health care utilization than their non-disabled peers.

I commend the authors for their interesting and solid work. I found the overall standard to be high and have only minor comments.

General Comments:

I found the manuscript to be lacking in a clear definition of intellectual disability and why certain disorders were selected. It seems like a number of mood, affective, stress related disorders, and schizophrenia are included in the ID cohort. I believe it would be beneficial for the reader to understand the motivation behind including some of the aforementioned disorders within the intellectual disability term.

Specific comments:

p. 3 Line 49-51, rephrase: "…reported that of inpatient stays (somatic and psychiatric) among people with ID, one-third were for psychiatric disorders."

p. 12 line 12, rephrase "If this is true also for people with ID is unknown" (e.g. "It is unknown whether this also applies to people with ID" or similar).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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