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Reviewer's report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

This manuscript suffers from a critical, logical fallacy: Because a particular pattern of care actually occurs and providers support it, then that pattern of care IS ASSUMED TO lead to better outcomes. In fact, the manuscript does not address the topic of outcomes, since actual outcome data have not been collected.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Subject-verb agreement p. 19: Prisoners DO

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Inadequate citation of the US literature, including work in Mental Health, United States and Psychiatric Services.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No
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