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Reviewer's report:

General
Costs of care for patients with schizophrenia is an important issue. However, I see several problems with this study and with the presentation of the results. In my opinion, the paper is quite complicated to read, since issues of outcome, costs of care and health of caregivers are presented in the same paper. It was not easy for me to grasp how the Taiwanese system is organized.

Basically, the main results are not very surprising, since the main finding is that the new, more expensive care system is associated with better outcomes. On the other hand, the authors could discuss more why the admission rate to hospital was higher in the study group since this finding seems in contradiction with the other findings.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

More specifically, I have the following comments:

Abstract, background: This study was (designed?) to investigate…

Background, p3, lines 44 and 45: it is not necessary to give 10 references (3-13) at a time. Moreover, they shouldn’t be qualified as “recent” because the first one was published in 1975 and the second one in 1980.

Line 57: the present tense is used (there are a few…) and line 58 the past tense is used (patients presented): the same tense should be used throughout the paragraph.

Methods: patients were selected randomly, but how: consecutive consultations? Alphabetic order? Some precisions could be helpful.

Research materials: WHO-QOL-BREF: authors mention a validation study of the adapted questionnaire and the original one. Is there a reference for this validation?

Chinese Health Questionnaire: What were the culturally relevant additional questions about?

Discussion:
Line 200: do the authors mean that the network system of the current study
would be considered as an ACT in the US? The comparison between the two systems is limited, since the network system did not “ban hospitalisations” (line 202).

Line 286: “beyond the small (number of?) participants”
Line 287: “we could only (get?) the costs”
Line 292: “decreased (length of?) hospital stay?”

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**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 limited interest

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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