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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the updated manuscript. My impression is that it has been much improved. This paper describes well the need for an integrated treatment program for this most disadvantaged group of clients.

It is good that the focus of the paper has now been oriented on describing the baseline characteristics of the clients. It is good to see that the limitations of the follow up data have been acknowledged.

I only have some minor language suggestions (listed below) that are not of material importance to the content of the paper.

Major compulsory revisions
nil

Minor essential revisions
nil

Discretionary revisions
C1
In the abstract, “methods”, you wrote, “The current article provides a description of the treatment program, a clinical profile of the population”. The comma should be replaced with “and”.

C2
Page 5 – “art and music therapist” should be plural? (i.e., art and music therapists)

C3
Table 1 – the text in the right most column (Treatment Elements) doesn’t appear to be vertically positioned correctly. For instance, “Recreational activities and Art therapy” for “Recovery 3” is shifted up.

C4
Page 7 – the sentences starting with “Demographic information...” and “Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview...” are rather awkward. Perhaps,
you could phrase it instead “We collected demographic information... etc.”

C5
Page 7 to 9 – consider summarising the rating tools/questionnaires used (e.g., a table for details and just the major points in text).

C6
Page 14 – abbreviating fetal alcohol spectrum disorder to FASD is unnecessary given that this term is only used once.
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