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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a good review of the evidence which will contribute to understanding how this important topic has been researched in recent years. The methods are appropriate and a relevant cohort of papers has been extracted within the review. There are some minor corrections to make within the text which I have identified below.

However, I feel the authors could highlight further the lack of intervention studies of good breadth and quality, and could indicate what future research should entail. The preponderance of questionnaires developed specifically for each study has been touched on but the reasons for this have not been adequately explored. The authors could consider highlighting the number of studies which were uni-professional and the impact that this may have had on the quality of the research.

The discussion section could be expanded to explore how nurses could and should work with other professionals to advance their practice and the evaluation of their practice in providing physical healthcare. The lack of reference to team working and multi-disciplinary care provision is stark within the discussion, and is indicative of the gap in the literature described in the review.

The authors make no reference to changes in healthcare policy and recently mandated changes to clinical practice in the UK (for example). Clinical practice cannot be seen to be independent of the healthcare regulators who protect the public and the authors should assure the reader that they are aware of this. The increase in research interest has been accompanied by an increase in the required levels of evidence around physical healthcare provision in mental health settings.

A more comprehensive account of the healthcare landscape in which these studies have taken place should be included, without which the review appears to continue a tradition of somewhat insular and blinkered nursing research.

Notes on the text:
Abstract

The total of 51 papers and 41 study samples does not correlate with the total of 44 identified in the PRISMA diagram.

Page 3

Line 4: Change to 'diagnosis of mental disorder'

Line 7: Insert 'diagnoses of' before 'psychosis'.

Line 9: delete 'for people with a diagnosis'

Line 19: Delete 'of mortality among people with mental disorder'.

Line 29: Insert 'in this group' after 'smoking'.

Line 36-37: The authors are suggesting that Robson and Haddad state that mental health nurses deficits is 'one of the key contributors' to increased mortality. Can they clarify that this is actually what they want to say?

Lines 51-56: Switching between consumers and mental health service users to describe the population- the inconsistency is somewhat confusing, unless the authors are quoting directly from the original papers. It would be preferably to choose one method of describing the group, whether patient, service users, or consumers, and stick to it throughout the paper. This confusion is further exemplified on page 13 lines 27-29 'nurses cite consumer embarrassment as a reason for not asking patients about sexual side effects'.

Page 6

Line 24-29: Please clarify whether studies on the deteriorating patient were not included- some text appears to be missing from this sentence.

Page 16

Line 1: The text 'to agree with their conclusion would be a disservice' is unclear. A disservice to whom or to what? Do the authors mean that Happell's conclusion was erroneous, as it was based on insufficient evidence?

Line 30: There appears to be an additional 'and' in the sentence - please delete
Lines 3-5: This sentence has some additional wording which confounds the meaning. Would be best rephrased as ‘there is consistent evidence of a strong association between…’.
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