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Reviewer's report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Awareness that the evidence base for the care of individuals with schizophrenia in non-LMIC may not apply to LMIC seems reasonable. However, the paper should not ignore the literature on effectiveness of psychosocial treatments generated in non-LMIC. It would help the paper to discuss now the treatments that emerged from their literature review and applied in their model relate to the evidence based practices that have been studied in non-LMIC.

2. Related to this is the need for a bit more description of the intervention elements. Were CBT type techniques used? Behavioral? Problem solving? Motivational interviewing?

3. It is not clear how the CLHW’s and their supervisors were selected and trained.

4. Given the importance of the psychiatrist as the cornerstone of treatment, it is important to understand their level of participation in the development of treatment.

5. It would be helpful to have a bit more description of the three study locations so that the international reader will have context.

6. The study/model lacks information about how a person would be referred for this program. For the purposes of the anticipated study, what are the inclusion criteria? Most important, is the model intended for people who are in an acute phase? Post-acute phase? Is this for treatment seekers? What is the role of family in this treatment seeking process? What if there is disagreement between the family and the patient? It would help to describe how this is conceptualized? Similarly, the model appears to be time-limited with a finite number of sessions. How is this conceptualized? Overall, more explanation about the beginning and the end of the program is required.

7. With respect to the statements (2nd paragraph after Phase 3): “A third of individuals were non-adherent with medication. Participants were willing to receive the CBI but recognised drug treatment as essential.”—Were these the same people?

• Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please indicate what MRC stands for.
• Discretionary Revisions
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