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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   • Should be rephrased. Suggestion: “This study presents an economic evaluation that we conducted alongside the randomized controlled trial to establish the cost-effectiveness of additional family psychoeducation versus no add-on treatment in the context of long-term continuation/maintenance treatment of major depression.”

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   • It is unclear whether all patients in both groups continued treatment with the antidepressant throughout the study and what is meant with dosage (table): which antidepressant was given?

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   • Yes. I have only two questions
   1. Was informed consent written informed consent (page 4)
   2. How is it possible that after randomization the group sizes were unequal: 30 versus 24?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   • Yes

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   • My only comment is that the authors are inconsistent in the use of the terms
‘relapse’ and ‘relapse/recurrence’. Actually they look at both relapse (return of depression during sustained response/remission within the first three months after the episode) and recurrence (thereafter)

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   • Yes

10. Few more suggestions:
   • Abstract, page 2, line 8: … (TAU) only or TAU plus….
   • Abstract, page 2, line 14: …. 167,430 (SD …. 
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