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Reviewer's report:

The question by the authors is well defined, and the article is very relevant and thorough. Also the introduction is very well written and easy to read.

Methods are appropriate and well described, and data are sound. The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition, and has a fine disposition. Discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data, and limitations of the studies well discussed.

It would be an interesting key aspect to also investigate treatment effect – to show that patient satisfaction do in fact support more positive treatment effect.

Finally the authors clearly acknowledge work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished with explicit appendixes/files.

In conclusion the article is very suitable for publishing. There are however some need for revision of the article before it can be decided.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

The selection of potentially relevant studies p.6 are a bit confusing as to the steps that were taken, and could be explained more clear. 1097 met inclusion criteria, then 128 articles were obtained in full text – does that mean the rest where excluded or? And if yes, on what basis? That is a bit unclear to me. Also I am curious as to how the screening DD-related articles led to exclusion of 101 articles. Could that be made more clear?

The writing is to a large extent acceptable, but some places language needs rewriting, especially the abstract for fluency, and generally checking for commas, vocabulary and use of certain words (i.e the word “true” p.15 is a bit odd), use of (N= ) or (n=).

The article seems more fluent in the introduction and from p. 11 – have different authors written different parts of the article, and have you rewritten the article for English fluency?

Minor Essential Revisions:

Would prefer more description of client profiles, i.e.:

a. SD on age
b. Although appendix is very detailed and well made, it could be nice with a little more background information in the article itself for its reader-friendliness – not in form of explanations, but in form of two lines of quick overview. For instance, if race is brought up, it would be nice to know about it in a little more details, so could they be described in percentage?
c. Also details on target groups are interesting and could be described shortly.

Regarding “Client rapports on treatment satisfaction”:
a. It is preferred that the high average satisfaction is calculated and explained in the text, although the file 4 shows it in details, again for reader-friendliness.
b. Also variability in satisfaction scores would be nice to get an overview of in the text along with the other descriptions of pt. variability.
c. Short overview of what treatment types that “form of integrated DD treatment” refers to would be preferred.
d. Question: is the multi-study on p. 11 out- or inpatient?
e. Page 12. Should the new study (31) not be started in a new paragraph like the other studies as for coherency in the analysis disposition?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

'I declare that I have no competing interests'