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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   No, they have many “aims” what makes the paper too open, and with many unanswered questions. I would suggest separating the different aims and try to write them in different papers.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, they used the method of systematic reviews, even though, as the question is to wide, many papers were included and the results are poorly described.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, I think they tried to do their best from the data available.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   I think the discussion and the conclusions are

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   No, I think it would be important to include a topic on the methodological limitations of the studies described.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   No. The abstract does not give any quantitative information about the results obtained, except the frequency of the use of LAIs.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

Major Compulsory Revisions
The paper is a critical review (even though the authors used the method of systematic reviews to retrieve the literature) on the use of LAIs in “daily practice”. Most of the results are qualitative and/or concern a single paper or some (but not all) papers, so that the conclusions should be considered with caution. Results obtained from a single paper (e.g., “A low-education background (p<.001) and poor insurance coverage (p=.009) were reported as significantly different among patients using LAIs versus oral antipsychotics [47]”, page 9) should not be generalized.

The main problem for me is the fact that there are too many “aims”, making it difficult to understand some of the results described. For example, in the section Results, subsection “perception of LAIs” the authors include a paper [26] that is a survey about the acceptance of LAIs by patients and psychiatrists. This is a very different kind of study in comparison to a prospective or retrospective study of a cohort or chart reviews, making it difficult to compare their results. In the section “adherence....” they begin with a long explanation about the concept of adherence and compliance, what does not belong to “results”.

So I would encourage the authors to narrow their objectives, maybe dividing all this content in different papers, each with a clear and specific aim, if they want to do systematic reviews.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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