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Reviewer's report:

On the whole, this systematic review, is a worthwhile addition to the literature, finding a significant benefit for both aripiprazole and risperidone in OCD. There is a clear agenda against the use of antipsychotics that often runs contrary to the evidence presented. This has no place in a meta-analysis.

I am in full agreement that antipsychotics need to be used cautiously, but the authors go too far in their assertions that these meta-analysis findings should be taken with caution, and the frequent “delegitimizing” of the aripiprazole findings, by stating that the studies were "early" and that they "may show diminished returns in the long term". This may be true, but no evidence is presented for this.

One gets the impression that the authors had decided on the introduction and the conclusions before conducting the meta-analysis, and their dismissal of the findings and frequent reliance on the preconcieved opinion makes it hard to take their legitimate safety concerns seriously.

In order to maximize impact, the authors should shift their tone and simply report their findings, starting in the abstract. The first sentence of the results needs to simply state that there was a significant acute benefit of aripiprazole and risperidone.

The legitimate concerns over longterm safety and efficacy, and the possible superiority of cognitive behavioral therapy should be moved to a subsection of the discussion.

Other issues:

1. Abstract: Spell out NICE
2. Copy edit the introduction and discussion. There are a number of run-on sentences, beginning with the first one.
3. The authors report that the NICe review from 2006 relied on a meta analysis from 2010. Please explain.
4. The authors cite Random house digest to support an exaggeration of effects. The authors decided not to do a funnel plot, which would be a better way to assess this.
5. Please double check the sentence on line 17 page 10. It was unclear
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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