The manuscript describes a multisite randomized controlled trial (RCT) designed to assess the effects of a motivation feedback intervention for patients with severe mental illness. It is an extremely well designed that should make an important contribution to the literature. There are, however, a few limitations that should be addressed.

Major Revisions

1. Patients with psychotic disorders and/or personality disorders are extremely different populations, and this is not sufficiently addressed. There is no discussion on why the same intervention is expected to work with these disparate populations. There is also no discussion on how the study manages acutely psychotic patients who may be actively hearing voices or paranoid. Moreover, why isn’t recruitment stratified by diagnosis? This would ensure that both conditions contain an equal number of patients from each diagnostic category.

2. The inclusion of the third objective examining the three theories of motivation provides the study with much needed depth. However, there is no discussion concerning the similarities or more importantly the differences between the theories, and why it is important to measure constructs from all three.

Minor Revisions

3. Page 5 first sentence of the third paragraph is awkward. I would revise it to read “solely providing feedback to clinicians of patients with severe mental illness might not be intensive enough to improve treatment engagement,” or something similar.

4. It would be helpful if inclusion exclusion criteria are expanded upon. Does “organic psychosyndrome” include dementia? Are suicidal patients excluded or included?

5. I am unfamiliar with some of the measures (e.g. Stigma-Scale, Temperament and Character Inventory) and would like a better description of their psychometrics (i.e., validity and reliability).

6. It seems as though there is not an attention control because the amount of treatment is no different between the conditions. The authors might want to make
this explicit.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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