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Reviewer’s report:

By utilizing the data obtained in the already published main study, the authors addressed the research question what clinical factors predict hospitalization of schizophrenic outpatients. The question is of great interest for the readers. The data collection process was well documented in the main RCT study. However, the manuscript did not appear to be very well organized. Additionally, it needs to be questioned whether this study added new findings to those of the main study.

The questions and concerns are listed below.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. There seemed to be no discussion about the finding concerning suicide threat as a predicting factor of hospitalization. This might be the important advantage of this study that the main study did not deal with.

   The authors should also include the definition of “suicide threat” in the manuscript. In addition, is the term, “suicide attempt” in Line 7, Page 10 a synonym for “suicide threat”, or not?

Minor Essential Revisions:

2. Why did not the authors refer Cox proportional hazard regression analysis in Abstract? It played an important role in the analysis of this study. In contrast, the authors referred to Kaplan-Meier product limit estimator in Abstract and Methods section, but seemingly only insufficiently presented its related results in Results section.

3. The most of descriptions of Abstract Background subsection are to be placed in Abstract Methods subsection in nature? Additionally, those of Abstract conclusions subsection seemed only summarizing the results of this study. They should be an integration of the results and the present research conditions.

4. In many parts of the manuscript, hospitalization and relapse were discussed in a parallel manner without sufficient attention to their difference. The authors need to organize the discussion by focusing their difference.

Discretionary Revisions:

5. The authors included solely Olanzapine LAI in the title, and explain the finding of Olanzapine LAI with more words than that of oral Olanzapine in Conclusion.
section though it could not be determined which was more excellent in terms of the findings of this study. Is it a neutral and balanced attitude?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.