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Reviewer's report:

The present paper describes the results of a Delphi consensus process aimed to identify commonly accepted concepts regarding the definition and assessment of functional recovery, as well as the perceived impact of psychosocial and pharmacological interventions on its attainment. Authors find out consensus on a high percentage of sections included in their initial questionnaire of functional recovery, including its definition and the need for its assessment, particular environmental factors associated with it as well as psychological and pharmacological treatments that contribute to it. Consensus is also found regarding the need to take into account different perspectives in its assessment. The areas with less consensus concern the scales commonly used for functional assessment, as well as factors influencing it.

The topic of this paper is of high clinical and research relevance. The paper is very well written, clear and precise, and I have no objections regarding its methodology. Results are concisely presented and discussed, highlighting the areas of higher consensus on functional recovery and also suggesting the need to continue working towards better agreed criteria defining the concept as well as a better agreement on the best instruments for its assessment. I believe that it makes a relevant contribution to the field of functional recovery in schizophrenia, shedding light on aspects that future research and clinical practice should focus on. In sum I think it is a very good piece of work that adds interesting information on the topic and is indeed worth publishing.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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