Dear editor

For clarification, we undertook bottom-up costing using individual participant data from the Low Prevalence Disorders Study in our costing study.1 We did not use the data reported in the study by Carr et al2 as asserted by Chong et al.3 Chong et al have thus misunderstood and thus misrepresented our methodology in both their systematic review4 and their response to our letter.5
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Dear editor

We thank Dr Neil and Professor Carr for their clarification on the data source used in their study.1 In this regard, we would like to highlight one of the most common challenges when conducting any systematic review, for example economic burden of schizophrenia in this case – the marked diversity in reporting among the included studies, which increases the likelihood of any potential misinterpretation. In convergence with a number of published systematic reviews of economic burden studies,2–5 there has been a consistent call for a more explicit reporting in various aspects of an economic burden study, thus readability and transparency can be enhanced. However, a standardized guide/checklist for conducting and reporting economic burden is yet to be available. On the final note, we strongly urge for the development of such a guidance document to improve the quality and clarity of an economic burden study.
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