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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Mme Calumpita,

I have reviewed the revised paper and I am satisfied that the authors have addressed to a large and credible extent, the issues raised in my review. Taken in conjunction with the revisions necessitated by the comments of the other reviewer, the paper now reads better than the previous version. I am of the opinion that the paper can be published as is.

I have some final small comments for the authors’ attention:

• The penultimate sentence in survey development section should read …”in order to minimize any bias…. ”

• The second sentence in the Background section might read better with a phrasing like:

“This study estimates the cost of resource utilisation associated with the administration of risperidone LAI and the potential savings from substituting the two-weekly injections with a therapeutically equivalent longer interval product”.

I note that the instructions that accompanied your message were same as in the original request to undertake the review. I hope it is not expected that I provide a review on all the points as in the first review.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in this review.

Best regards

Tuoyo Okorosobo
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