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REFEREE REPORT FORM

Manuscript title:
Guidelines for the use and management of long-acting injectable antipsychotics in serious mental illness

summary: The authors report on data coming from a nationwide survey on the use of LAI antipsychotics conducted in experts treating patients suffering from schizophrenia or bipolar disorder having published / done research on the use of LAI in the past. They handed out an elaborate survey and achieved an almost 80% response rate. Outcomes are presented and discussed.

questions/comments:

Abstract, section “results and discussion”
From the current wording it is not possible to differentiate the outcomes of the survey reported and the interpretation / additional information coming from the panel. The authors may more clearly label where the respective data comes from.

The last paragraph of this section is not understandable and needs some language revision.

Materials and methods, section “questionnaire development”
The authors should briefly list the compounds listed in France as SGA and FGA LAIs respectively here (page 7 of the PDF). Referring to table 1 is too complicated as it lists a lot of different compounds holding a marketing authorization in European countries. As France was the target of the current survey only the current situation regarding available LAIs in this very country is key for interpretation of the data.

Materials and methods, section “data analysis”
The statement “What's more, if at least 20% of the experts replied in zone 0 and a first-line or second-line treatment could be selected, the question was considered as non-consensual.” seems to be redundant as this was already stated just some lines before. The corresponding table needs revision in the last line as a rating of “0” exceeding 20% already led to a non-consensus statement.
Results, section “indications”
The authors switch back and forth between listing indications or compound groups (FGA or SGA LAI). Reporting the results either based on “indication” or “compound group” (as in the corresponding table) would be a lot easier to grasp. Mixing the reference point may lead to confusion.

Results, section “introduction period”
The statement “can be used from the first psychotic episode” is not in line with the categories of ratings mentioned in the methods section of the manuscript. With all results in this section of the manuscript the authors should clearly state the respective rating as otherwise interpretation/speculations/opinions mix with survey results. Also in the tables referring to these outcomes the wording is not in line with the categories. A uniform way of presenting the outcomes is recommended.

Results section, general concern
As the respective concrete questions of the survey are not reported upon the reader cannot assess how the questions were posed. This leaves a lot of room for speculation. The authors do publish a link to the questionnaire to my understanding (as the complete questionnaire is surely too elaborate to be published) but 1 or 2 examples of how questions were phrased would still be helpful.

With a lot of presented results it remains unclear how they derive from the questionnaire (categories do not match; additional information is sometimes reported with certain questions but it is somehow unclear if this was part of the questionnaire or reflects the authors view).

The entire results section needs profound revision.

Discussion
The authors do refer to the expert consensus programs already published but do not present their data in the same way. As the concrete questions are not published the outcomes are hardly interpretable for the reader (and they cannot be differentiated from mere opinion coming from the authors rather than the surveyed experts).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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