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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes an important study about remission which will be of interest to most researchers and clinicians who work with those with schizophrenia. My review is below:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? This ms addresses the differences in costs of mental health services and functional outcomes between those patients with schizophrenia who achieve remission criteria and those who don't. The research question is well defined and clearly articulated.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? The methods are described clearly and are appropriate.

3. Are the data sound? The data appear to be quite sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? The data are clearly reported.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Although the findings are clearly stated, the discussion could be stronger if the authors include recent recovery literature. As they state, "meeting the criteria for remission does not imply recovery in schizophrenia" which is quite true, yet the authors have neglected to mention or clarify "psychosocial treatment" geared to recovery. In this ms, the authors should refer to this work, (for example Silverstein and Bellack, 2008, and Lysaker, Roe, & Buck, 2010, Barber, 2012, to name only a few). Additionally recent literature devoted to rehabilitation efforts and employment for those with schizophrenia may explain some of the variance between non-remitted and remitted patients in terms of employment (Lysaker, et, al, 2012). These additions to the discussion are considered to be compulsory.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, but see 5 above.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, the writing is quite clear and well-written.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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