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Abstract

No comments

Introduction

Please insert page numbers particularly since the line numbers restart at each page.

Methods

"The Floresco intake officers determined the eligibility of clients at the intake appointment, and then introduced the client to a researcher (IP or DB). Where possible the researcher waited onsite at the time of intake appointments; otherwise, telephone contact was used."

When discussing recruitment, it is imperative to state that informed consent was obtained. The authors need to describe how informed consent was obtained with the participants. I was also unable to find a statement or details of ethics approval for this study.

Results

"However, the average number of diagnoses per client was higher in the follow-up study group, as were the rate of psychosis, suicide risk and the prevalence of additional factors affecting mental health at intake to Floresco"

No possible explanation is given for this change.

Discussion

It is well known that service system integration is possible only when certain conditions are met. These conditions are not easy to meet and successes have been documented in very few circumstances where passionate individuals decide to make it work despite the odds. This study does not report anything new in that sense.
Overall impression

The topic for this study continues to be one of interest because although it is necessary for multiple agencies to work together, to provide recovery oriented care to persons with severe mental illness, there is still no formula on how this can be implemented across different settings. This study provides yet another example of how some people have tried their best to make it work with little to show for their efforts. My main concerns however are as follows:

1. A lack of ethics approval statement and informed consent from participants
2. Major gaps in available data making it difficult to make sound conclusions

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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