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Reviewer's report:

This revision has responded to the majority of suggestions. One major and several minor edits would help optimize the manuscript.

Major Point:
The authors responded well and clearly to the issue of whether second- or third-line treatments were allowed to count as guideline-concordant. However, this needs to be placed in the methods, up front, and not simply mentioned in the discussion. Additionally, it is not clear exactly what the criteria were for allowing second- or third-line treatments to count. There is a slight difference among (a) their point 1 response, (b) their point 6 response, and (c) their statement in the text on page 16 paragraph 1: Was their requirement that the patient have evidence of "the first line recommendations had been already prescribed" (point 1 response), or was it simply assumed that since they were coming to a tertiary care center that this was the case if they were on a second- or third-line treatment ("was likely", point 6 response and text page 16)? So this needs to be clarified and placed in the Methods.

Minor:
No mention is made of aripiprazole or ziprasidone, which were available in the US at the time of this study--if not so in Canada, it would be helpful to mention; or if not endorsed by CANMAT guidelines, that would be good to know.

On Tables 4 & 5, it would be helpful to have a right-hand column with the row totals.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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