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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study addressing an important area i.e. physical health of individuals with serious mental illness. Whilst the publication of a quality improvement study is to be welcomed in it's current format it is quite difficult for the reader to discern what has specifically been undertaken and what the plans for the future study are. Specifically:-

The intervention is described in the methods however there is a level of detail missing such as:

- who are the research team and team members who designed the intervention?
- did the development involve any service users?
- Why is there a need for a new PHP when there are four in use already - in what ways does the developed tool differ from these?
- Figure 1 is not helpful, could a more complete version of the PHP giving a sense of the questions asked be included

A theory of change is mentioned which is helpful, however are there any higher level theories used to guide the intervention e.g. psychological or behavior change theories. Which clinicians do you hope will feel better able to care for physical health, is the PHP acting as a mechanism of communication and referral between physical and mental health teams - should this be in the ToC?

In stage 1 and stage 2 there seems to be some straddle between intervention and implementation strategies such as the initial discussion with teams to gain buy in, having the PHP available through different modes. It would be helpful to be clearer about the different function of elements and describe these more appropriately.

There is no mention of consent in the study. If this is not considered necessary for a quality improvement study this should be mentioned.

The study says that it uses recognized QI methodology could the authors be clearer about what this is.
Outcomes - some of these are repeated and thus this section needs reviewing

I am not clear on who completes the PHP, what is the definition of SMI used here, at which clinics, what about individuals without a clinic appointment, also when are repeat PHPs conducted, is this formalized or dependent on the occurrence of clinic appointments - more detail is needed

The discussion is weak, consisting of only one paragraph and more reflective and thorough discussion is necessary.
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