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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper is much clearer and easier to read now. Some suggested changes below.

**Abstract**

First sentence of conclusion has a missing word - 'chronic physical DISEASES living in' the conclusion of the abstract is different from the conclusion of the paper. The paper concludes that mental disorders are burdensome and mental health care needs to be integrated into physical care. The abstract concludes there is not enough evidence. I think the paper is right.

**Background**

Some of the figures on chronic disease are not very helpful. The WHO references seem to be press releases from 2005. The 2016 Global Burden of Disease study would be better. Chronic disease is such a huge category that it is almost inevitably going to be the world's largest cause of death. It's more relevant to talk about years of life with chronic disease.

**Methods**

The definition of chronic disease used here actually encompasses most mental disorders as well. It might be better to list the chronic physical diseases you searched for (diabetes, cancer, cardiovascular disease, COPD and obesity). Incidentally, is obesity a disease?

'type of continent' is just continent.

**Results**

Missing word, '40 articles involving 21,747 PARTICIPANTS' (or subjects)

**Figure 1**

'Excluded for neurotropic parasites' is true but confusing. Maybe say 'Analysed separately' rather than excluded.
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