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Reviewer’s report:

This paper describes an important study of all Norwegian residents from 25 to 60 years of age and their GPs during 2007 – 2009. Results were compared for 10,112 patients had a diagnosis of schizophrenia (0.4%), 54580 patients who had a diagnosis of diabetes and the total population (n=2,333,944) . The authors draw some interesting conclusions which could be the basis of further study.

As well as a detailed editing here are some suggestions that the authors might want to consider for improving the paper:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  1. The manuscript still requires quite extensive editing (see below) and some statements could do with being substantiated with a reference.
  2. The abstract should contain more information on numbers included in the analysis and all initials should be clear.
  3. Some statements need revising eg pg 14 “increasing list size (more patients) reduced the service for list patients with schizophrenia...” I suggest changing to “increasing list size (more patients) was associated with a reduction in the service use for patients with schizophrenia”.

- Minor Essential Revisions
  4. NOK should be spelled out in full (not just in Table 3)

- Discretionary Revisions
  5. The authors discuss co-morbidity in the discussion section. If it was possible / straightforward it would be useful to add the mean number of comorbidities for each of the groups as this was the rationale for selecting the diabetes comparison group - they also have an “increased prevalence of chronic somatic conditions”.
  6. If this was possible it could also be added to the regression model.
  7. There were differences in age between the groups but this wasn’t discussed as a factor that might explain some of the other differences observed.
  8. The discussion section might benefit from some further structure e.g. implications for practice/ research

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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