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Dear Dr. Crow:

My colleagues and I wish to thank you for your continued interest in our manuscript (MS: 228582695223602 "Healthcare Utilization and Costs in Hospitalized Patients with Schizophrenia or Bipolar Disorder Receiving Second-Generation Antipsychotics: A Retrospective Cohort Study"). We have revised our manuscript based on the additional comments that we received, as follows:

**Reviewer 1 (Carolyn Dewa)**

1. It is now clearer why these three SGAs were chosen. Also, the authors have highlighted that this study’s contribution to the knowledge base about adherence is mainly in the area of post-discharge.

   *We thank the reviewer for this comment, and have taken no further action.*

2. The diagram the authors have added to address the exclusion criteria is adequate.

   *We thank the reviewer for this comment, and have taken no further action.*

3. Half of the Discussion section focuses on adherence. The other half focuses on limitations of the data. In their response to the reviewer comments, the authors were convincing in their argument that their data are not sufficient to comment on the relationship between costs and adherence (i.e., the sample size is too small and the study duration too short to say anything meaningful). This point might also be included in the limitations.

   *As requested, we have added text to the limitations section of the Discussion to include this point.*

4. The Discussion section still seems to be somewhat disconnected from the paper title and the results. Indeed, there are results about adherence and the authors devote the Discussion to this topic. However, they offer no comments about their utilization and cost results. Given the paper title suggests that they focus on utilization and costs, what is the main point that the authors wish
to make about these? On the other hand, if the main point is no about utilization and costs, perhaps the title should reflect the main point brought out in the Discussion section.

We agree with the reviewer’s comment and have revised the title of our manuscript to reflect the fact that we focus attention exclusively on medication adherence and utilization (i.e., the title is now consistent with the Discussion). In keeping with the focus of our manuscript, we also have removed mention of healthcare utilization and cost during follow-up from the Methods and Results sections.

In addition to our responses to the reviewer’s comments, we also note that in response to a prior request from this reviewer, we added a diagram that describes the sample-selection process for both the schizophrenia and bipolar cohorts, respectively. This diagram, however, contains a great deal of information that is currently captured in Table 1. Accordingly, in the interests of conserving space, and at your discretion, we would not object to the removal of either Table 1 or Figure 1 (and do not have a preference as to which is removed).

We thank you again for your interest in our manuscript. Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions or concerns. My colleagues and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Ariel Berger, M.P.H.