**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Group differences for sum and YLS at admission + selected covariates (targeting Gunnar’s RQ1)

There was insufficient evidence suggesting any group differences at admission. In particular, clients’ starting behaviour (*F*2,515=0.65, *p*>.10) and risk levels (*F*2,515=1.73, *p*>.10) were comparable. Among the covariates, groups differed marginally in age (*F*2,515=2.67, *p*=.070). Among the covariates, only age appeared to differ across the three groups (*F*2,515=2.67, *p*=.070).

Effectiveness measures (bottom two rows of Table 2) + “-14 to 25 table” + Figure 1 Figure 1 (histograms) (targeting RQ2)

**Correlation**

* Weak correlations between covariates for Model 1 and 2 => no multicollinearity (model assumption)
* “That photo” for Model 3 growth curve: strong correlations of across time

**Model Results**

***Regression Models for FFT/MST Effectiveness***

***Latent Growth Curve Model***

The intercept (*i*) in a latent growth curve model reports the starting points of one’s growth trajectory. Older clients appeared to start their recoveries from lower points than their younger peers. This effect was strong and stable for both the before (, *p*=.020) and after (, *p*<.001) groups but not significant for the during group/during the pandemic.

The slope (*s*) in a latent growth curve signals the speed of recovery. The recovery rates were marginally lower for clients with favourable risk reduction profiles (-0.002, *p*=.007 and -0.003, *p*<.001 for before and after groups respectively) except during the COVID pandemic.