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**Reviewer’s report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper. The authors should be commended on investigating this group of clients with such complex needs and for providing good detail on the phases of their program. The following issues however need attention:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. Ninety two participants completed the minimal baseline assessment with 47 clients completing the follow-up assessment. This attrition is a major issue and needs to be addressed in the Discussion under the Limitations section. It is likely that those participants lost to follow-up represent those with poorer outcomes and this is likely to affect the validity of the findings. It does appear from Table 3 that those assessed at Follow-up had more severe scores at baseline but this needs to be clarified by the authors.

2. It is stated under the "Follow-Up Results" that "Baseline data were collected from June 2009 to January 2010. Follow up assessment was completed in March 2010." Can the authors clarify whether all follow-ups occurred in March? If so, the follow-up assessment would have had a significant time range, occurring between 3-9 months after the initial assessment rather than being a true 6-month follow-up. Again, this would be expected to impact upon the results.

3. Within the Instruments section, can the authors please provide some information about the interpretation of the test scores (e.g. range of scores).

4. I think the results section needs to be more detailed. In particular, full test statistics for significant results need to be presented in the text rather than just p-values in some of the tables. Also, the results shown in Table 6, which are quite impressive are barely reported in the results section.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

5. Some of the grammar needs revision, particularly the incorrect use of commas. There are also some spelling mistakes in the paper.

6. At the bottom of Table 3, the authors need to explain what the asterisks represent. Preferably, they should report the actual p-value as presented in Table 6.
7. In the discussion, it is stated "as shown by the improvement in psychopathological symptoms, decreased substance use and reduction in crime". Can the authors please explain where the crime rate data is derived from?

**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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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