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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent study, well written and well presented. I do believe it adds considerably to our understanding of the training of personnel who deal with people with dual diagnoses as well raising a number of pertinent questions. All aspects of the paper are strong including methodology, analyses and discussion. The only issues I would like to raise are:

- What was the rationale for deciding on the measurement tools? Why these and not others?
- Though the type of services a person works in influences what they do, are there any inferences that could be drawn from this study about the ideal services that assist in retaining skills that have been acquired through courses?
- Why were the data collected at the times they were? i.e. at 20 months follow-up? Could they have been collected at other times?
- It would have been interesting to know whether there is a point at which learning begins to erode and if so what is that point??
- Why do the authors think that knowledge acquisition was the strongest outcome?

I regard these as minor observations and they could be easily addressed.