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Dear Editorial Board Members of BMC Psychiatry,

We are pleased to enclose our revised manuscript on treatment satisfaction and would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers. We value their positive feedback and their additional comments were very useful and helped us improving the manuscript. We appreciate your continued interest in the manuscript and we should be most grateful if you consider it for publication in BMC Psychiatry. A point-by-point response to the reviewers’ concerns follows below.

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Sabrina Schulte
Prof. Dr. Petra Meier
Dr. John Stirling

*Note: Revisions in the manuscript have been marked by tracked changes and/or yellow highlighting.*
**Referee 1**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**
No further revisions required. An already interesting manuscript has improved.

**Minor Essential Revisions**
No further revisions required

**Discretionary Revisions**
I will leave this up to the authors: but I think they should mention that they tried to conduct a meta-analysis of the data, and mention as a limitation of their review that such a meta-analysis could not be carried out.

**Authors’ response:**
We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion and therefore have made the following revisions in the manuscript:

 قولون: ُه، *Furthermore, we intended to include a meta-analysis of those studies that address research question 2 and 3. However, due to the small number of studies available, difficulties in the data preparation process (i.e. statistics required for calculating effect measures were missing in two articles), and high heterogeneity among studies, we considered a quantitative synthesis of data inappropriate for the current review.”*

 قولون: ُه، *p. 21: “A limitation of the current review is that no meta-analysis could be carried out. A quantitative synthesis of data could have taken into account small sample sizes and moderate – if not significant – effects thus providing further insight into the current evidence base. Depending on the growth of studies in this field, future reviews should include such analyses where possible.”*
Reviewer 2:
The authors’ corrections have improved the manuscript, and their point-by-point response is very detailed, so it is easy to assess the corrections. Thank you.
I now consider the article ready for publication.
I do have some suggestions for minor essential revisions which basically concerns a rewriting of some of the places in the article for use of the term ‘however’ and commas. Although I am not English speaking myself, it seems as if some commas would help the text, i.e. p. 5. in the first 6 lines in Methods. Also the term ‘however’ could some places be exchanged with other words, as it seems to be very used throughout the article.
Although you have chosen to describe the studies in each paragraph in your review of satisfaction levels and their correlation with different types of treatment models starting at p. 10., it would be helpful for the reader if you made the shifts between the paragraphs more clear. Sometimes it is as if you continue a discussion, and it may confuse the feeling of overview of the different studies in this section.
Finally a reflection: In an ongoing study on treatment satisfaction in substance abuse treatment, we have noticed that patients in methadone maintenance or other forms of medical substitution tend to be less satisfied with treatment, often explaining their satisfaction with that they at least get the medicine that they need, even if they are not especially satisfied with other aspects of treatment. I think that this makes substitution a relevant factor worth describing when measuring client satisfaction and their link to specific treatment places.

Authors’ response:
We appreciate the reviewer’s comments about grammar and style and carefully checked the manuscript for commas and repeated usage of the term ‘however’. Commas have been inserted as suggested on p. 6 and in some other parts of the manuscript. The term ‘however’ has been replaced in several places with the terms ‘though’, ‘but’ or ‘yet’.
Furthermore, we went through the results section and divided a few sections into smaller paragraphs so that shifts from one study to another are now more explicit (please see tracked changes in manuscript from p. 7 to 17).
**Reviewer’s reflection:**

We acknowledge the reviewer’s reflection and share the opinion that the prescription of methadone or other forms of medical substitution may affect a number of treatment outcomes. Furthermore, methadone dosage levels have been identified as relevant in this context with higher methadone levels being associated with better retention rates for example (e.g. Villafranca, McKellar, Trafton, & Humphreys, 2006). We strongly agree that further research is needed to investigate potential relationships between substitute prescribing and treatment satisfaction. Consequently, we added this aspect in the recommendations for future research on p. 21 in the manuscript.

---

**Extra comments provided by BMC Psychiatry in email to the corresponding author:**

We thank you for your revisions, and feel that we are close to having your paper ready for publication.

You need to check the fluency of the writing of the results section. In some places you are counting studies in a way that is somewhat confusing.

Some examples are listed below:

"In another study where greater variability was also shown, the scale that was used covered several aspects beyond treatment satisfaction, which complicates the interpretation of the score range."

A reference would be helpful here.

**Authors’ response:**

We agree that the sentence identified by the reviewer needs referencing to avoid confusion. The according reference is: Clark and colleagues (2008) with the reference number [41]. The above-mentioned sentence refers to the high level of variability in the mean satisfaction score of the total client sample (i.e. intervention and control group together) at baseline (mean score=76.7, SD=12.40; see also Table 1 in manuscript). We inserted the according reference at the end of
the above-mentioned sentence (please see manuscript, p. 10) and additionally included the information about the mean score and standard deviation for the total client sample in Additional File 4 (highlighted in yellow).

This sentence:
"The other three studies were conducted in outpatient treatment settings."
Confused me as well. I had to scroll back up to remember that it was out of the studies that compared integrated versus mono-focus treatments. It is probably not the sentence itself, but the writing of the previous paragraphs that had left me confused. Please clarify the results section so that the results are easy to understand.

You might consider summarizing the results in a few places (something like: "These ... studies showed that patients receiving integrated treatment were/were not more satisfied" or "Given the methodological limitations of these studies, ...whether or not integrated treatments")

Authors’ response:
We appreciate the reviewer’s comments and the above-mentioned sentence has been clarified as follows:

⇒ p. 12: “The other three studies that compared satisfaction levels between DD clients who were provided with either integrated or standard care were conducted in outpatient treatment settings.”

Furthermore, we cautiously went through the results section and made a number of revisions to ensure all paragraphs carry consistent referencing and provide a clear summary of which studies reported what findings. Statements that appeared confusing or vague have been revised accordingly (please see tracked changes in manuscript from p. 7 to 17).

Additional note by the authors:
Based on the journal’s guidelines, we re-examined the text, tables, other additional files and references in order to ensure that our manuscript fully conforms to the journal style.