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Dear Editor,

We are grateful and pleased with the reviewer’s reports. The comments and suggestions have given us insights and thoughts, that resulted in major adjustments in the manuscript. Here we give a point-by-point response to the concerns.

**Reviewer 1: Tiina Podymow**

It is incredibly long, a lot of narrative: deleted the narrative part and shortened the article significantly.

Major questions: questions are answered in the introduction.

Revision: The title is adjusted and the term convalescence is introduced and used throughout the manuscript.

Page 2-5: all suggestions are included and questions are answered.

Objectives: suggestions are included at the end of the introduction.

Methods: suggestions are included.

Paragraph: deleted

Collected data section: revised and shortened.

Page 8: referring partners: revised and shortened.

Page 9: suggestions adjusted.

Results: suggestions included, re-stating avoided, shortened.

Page 10: suggestions adjusted, questions answered.

Page 11: suggestions adjusted.

Page 12: suggestions adjusted, questions answered.

Page 13-17: suggestions adjusted.

Page 18: conclusion paragraph moved to first paragraph in discussion. Suggestions addressed.

Table 5: better organized.

**Reviewer 2: Lillian Gelberg**

Overall comments

3. policy driven aims included.

4. housed comparison group for mortality adjusted.

7. medical record data are addressed in the method section

**Reviewer 3: Norweeta Milburn**

Introduction:

1. narrative deleted

2. focus on homeless adults, adjusted.

3. Significance of the contribution addressed.

Method:

1. patients consent issue addressed.

2. methodological issues addressed.
Results:
1 injectors issue addressed in the results.
2 findings and implications are addressed in the discussion.

Discretionary Revision:
1 editing performed
2 respectful language used

Reviewer 4: Ellen Bassuk

Major Revisions:
Findings further explained, program and policy implications discussed.
Health problems and mortality issues addressed.
Personality disorder issue addressed.
What more can be done, addressed in the discussion.
Tables adjusted, parts omitted, table 3 is included in table 1, totalling 4 tables instead of 5.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Page 7: paragraph deleted

We thank the reviewers for their time and clear comments.

Best regards,

Igor van Laere, Matty de Wit and Niek Klazinga

Amsterdam