

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Substance-related and addictive disorders among adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD): An Ontario population-cohort study
AUTHORS	Lin, Elizabeth; Balogh, Robert; McGarry, Caitlin; Selick, Avra; Dobranowski, Kristin; Wilton, Andrew; Lunsky, Yona

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Pawlowska Beata Medical University of Lublin Department of Psychiatry Poland
REVIEW RETURNED	11-Mar-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	The strength of this paper is that it encompasses a large population.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Laurence Taggart Institute of Nursing & Health Research Ulster University Northern Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Mar-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a leading research article linking large data sets on people with intellectual disability (ID) and the non-disabled population who abuse substances, and people with ID who not abuse substances. The paper has reviewed the latest literature and the aim of the study is clearly written. Methods and data analysis are clearly written. Results although technical, still are clearly presented.</p> <p>The results are startling and will have significant implications in how services could be developed and delivered to address the underlying mental health problems and related substance abuse issues with this population (i.e. risk factors, health promotion, diagnosis, interventions, clinical management). The results also have significant implications in how different agencies (ID services, addiction services, mental health services, housing, public health agency, etc) should be working together. My only recommendation is that a few more sentences should be included in the last section of the discussion. Otherwise this paper should be fast tracked to publication.</p> <p>Well done to the authors, I really enjoyed reading this paper.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Jessica L King University of Florida, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jun-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	Clearly written and informative manuscript on a significant topic. With the exception of a couple grammatical/formatting errors or inconsistencies, overall very well done. One minor concern is that the belief that adults with IDD do not have access is only one of several reasons for lack of research in this area, which is not what is implied in the opening sentence. This phrase could be removed or reworded to more accurately portray the research status.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

From Reviewer 2

My only recommendation is that a few more sentences should be included in the last section of the discussion. TEXT HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF THE MANUSCRIPT.

From Reviewer 3

1.a couple grammatical/formatting errors or inconsistencies -- WE HAVE PROOFREAD THE MANUSCRIPT AGAIN. (WE WERE NOT ABLE TO FIND ANY FORMATTING ISSUES)
2. One minor concern is that the belief that adults with IDD do not have access is only one of several reasons for lack of research in this area, which is not what is implied in the opening sentence. This phrase could be removed or reworded to more accurately portray the research status. THIS PHRASE HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE FIRST SENTENCE

Additional changes

1. In preparing the revised manuscript, we realized that we had not been specific in how we were interpreting effect sizes and, for Table 1, had been inconsistent in our interpretation method. We have added an explanatory sentence at the end of the Methods, changed the shading of a few cells in Table 1, and revised the accompanying text in the Results section (paragraphs 2 and 3).
2. In reviewing the STROBE check-list, we realized that we had not addressed generalizability. We have added text to the Discussion, paragraph 3 about this.
3. We have added two articles (#11 and #27) in our review and discussion.