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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The manuscript deals with a topic of major clinical relevance, the relationships between improvement of psychopathology, patient’s satisfaction and compliance.

It is certainly worth being published, however, some issues should be considered in the moderately revised version.

1. The abstract does not include any statistical data such as p-values etc. aside from predictor variables explained over 30% of the variance in medication.
2. The major finding that patient satisfaction is related to symptom improvement, particularly improvement of positive symptoms, might be related to the duration of the trial. Within 6 weeks, positive symptoms usually decline much more than negative or other symptoms. This issue should be mentioned more in the discussion.
3. The statistical analysis is described, but for me it is not clear whether the findings would be the same if the analysis were done totally independent of medication. Efficacy and side effects profile of quetiapine, risperidone and certainly placebo differ markedly. Thus, the relationships mentioned above should also differ. I am not sure whether the statistical analysis, done by the authors, is appropriate.
4. Most important for me would be the question whether compliance is more related to the patient’s perspective (satisfaction) or to the doctor’s perspective (improvement of psychopathology). I am not sure whether this simple, but important question has been answered by the statistical procedures mentioned.

Since the authors apparently used a non-standard principal component analysis, more details and references need to be provided to assess the validity of this approach. For example, the extraction criteria (Kaiser-Guttman, Scree-plot etc.) are not described and it is unclear which items were entered in the PCA. I would recommend that the authors perform a standard PCA, save the factor variable to the matrix and then correlate these with the dependent variables (e.g., MSQ).

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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