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Reviewer’s report:

Many of my points provided on my previous review have not been adequately addressed. Your response in your letter only indicated that you expanded the definition of insight and its relevance to your participants. Please provide a letter that addresses clearly each point made in the previous review; either how you addressed it in your revision or why you decided that you did not feel you needed to respond to it.

The major flaw in this paper which has not been adequately addressed is the implication that having access to food will improve adherence to medication. While it is obvious that this marginalized group of people need more economic support in Ethiopia, there is no research that I have found to support the idea that food increases levels of adherence to medication. In fact, the reference cited, #29, provides support for the idea that weight gain and associated obesity is a RISK factor for noncompliance.

Additionally, the authors failed to reference some of their own work regarding perceived causes of severe mental disturbance and preferred interventions which identifies the supernatural and religious factors which affects peoples’ beliefs about severe mental illness (and consequent behavior). It seems that psychoeducation to address some of these beliefs would be essential. This is only briefly mentioned as an intervention to improve compliance in the current ms. Was this a different study? Were the authors only interviewing the sample of people who had sought mental health treatment in the clinic?

The authors need to address these issues, as well as the others mentioned in my previous review. Obviously this is important work, but the paper as currently organized continues to need work and revision.
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