I commend the authors both for contributing to implementing a more systematic, comprehensive, and multi-dimensional assessment of bipolar patients and for reporting preliminary results of this new health service. The publication of these findings will be essential to determine the effectiveness of this new infrastructure and could be the first step towards using a similar approach in other clinical populations. I have a few methodological questions that I would like the authors to address. I think these revisions will be essential to strengthen the understanding of these findings, and will be of relevance for follow-up studies and adaptations in other clinical settings.

1. Outcome measures. A solid assessment of the effectiveness of a mental health service requires 1. A benchmark to compare measures to; along 2. Multidimensional measures. I am therefore surprised that the authors 1. Did not report national statistics related to clinical outcomes relative to current treatments or treatment as usual for bipolar patients; and 2. Did not administer self-rating questionnaires measuring how patients felt (e.g. severity of mood symptoms, perceptions of health status and well-being, general life satisfaction, quality of life). Could the authors address this in the manuscript?
2. The authors should characterize what kind of treatment/clusters of treatments patients were provided. It’s otherwise hard to understand what kind of treatment/s led to the improvement described in the manuscript.
3. Another issue is whether this improvement could be related to the additional care/assessment patients were provided. Please address this issue in your conclusions.
4. Table 1 should provide demographics/clinical/professional information both at baseline and after intervention
5. Statistics: I would highly recommend that the authors write two separate paragraphs describing the linear mixed model and the generalized linear model. I would attempt to describe them thoroughly. Please make sure to clearly mention the predictors, potential transformations etc. of variables, how and whether you checked for multicollinearity (please provide correlations or appropriate parameters).
6. For the GLM I may have missed it but I don’t see a table for the results with betas, R2 etc.
7. Page 10. Could you please clarify what was exactly done to “compute analytical weights that are inversely proportional to the probability of remaining in the study”.
8. In table 4 please provide coefficient beta, SE beta, and effect size. Also please provide a suitable explanation for all acronyms (this applies to all tables). By the way what does “bipolar disorders 1 vs NOS” refer to?
9. Minor details. 1. Please make sure to state in your abstract that it was an adult population and possibly gender %. 2. As a rule of thumb, a caption should provide enough information to the reader so that they would not have to refer to the text to understand what they are looking at. For instance, in Table 2 it would be good to know what .57 refers to. Is this calculated by subtracting the current number of hospitalization to the number of hospitalization at baseline? Please make sure to change all your captions keeping this rule of thumb in mind.