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Reviewer's report:

The rationale of this meta-analytic study is clear in that a critical mass of psychosocial psychosis intervention studies have emerged but has yet to be synthesized, which constitutes a gap in the literature. This meta-analytic study is well-written, thorough, and will be a valuable resource for global mental health researchers.

Given that this manuscript has already been revised, I have a minor comment and a single more substantial comment (denoted with **):

1) Lines 126-127—Could this sentence clarify whether the study includes non-randomized as well as randomized studies?

2**) One substantive comment-- other than sporadic mentions throughout the text, I was unable to locate information regarding the actual locale of the settings, in terms of whether they were located in urban vs. rural settings within the LMIC in question. This is important because these locales differ greatly in terms of treatment disparities even within LMIC (as noted briefly by the authors in the Discussion). Also, community integration efforts may differ substantially in one locale vs. another. This important study feature might be included in the Methods, Table 1 (as a separate column), Results/Analyses, and Discussion. It may be that these interventions take place in all or primarily rural areas; if so it would help to specify this in the manuscript as it will provide context by which to interpret the interventions’ effects. This information will help to strengthen an already well-written manuscript.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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