Reviewer’s report

Title: Mapping the evidence on pharmacological interventions for non-affective psychosis in humanitarian non-specialized settings: a UNHCR clinical guidance

Version: 1 Date: 04 Aug 2017

Reviewer: Takefumi Suzuki

Reviewer's report:

The authors have adequately addressed concerns raised by the referees. The reviewer would like to raise one further issue, which relates to Figure 1. It is the very essence of this work and should be concise but accurate. The recommended dose ranges must be based on evidence. Some appear rather aggressive (e.g., clozapine 900mg) while others sound conservative (e.g., chlorpromazine 25mg) - supportive references should be appropriately cited. Additionally although antipsychotics differ in their propensity to cause different adverse events they do have something in common. For instance every antipsychotic could cause extrapyramidal side effects (depending on the dosage), metabolic derangements and weight gain. QTc prolongation is not specific to oral haloperidol but the risk is much higher when used intravenously. Haloperidol is not immune to hyperprolactinemia. Anticholinergic, antiadrenergic and antihistaminergic effects can be problematic for some of the antipsychotics in particular. As such comments for each of antipsychotic may be summarized altogether in a different box as a common precaution for all antipsychotics in general.

No further comments.
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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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