

APPENDIX F:

Supplementary Quantitative Results

SUPPLEMENTARY QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The purpose of this appendix is to provide more detailed quantitative results and some supplemental results. **Section F-1** presents analyses that use data from the Alabama site (AltaPointe) and a comparison group of ACT clients from Mobile or Baldwin Counties. **Section F-2** presents a set of analyses that used secondary administrative data sources. The goal of these analyses was to confirm findings based on self-reported primary data where equivalent or similar outcomes were available. **Section F-3** presents our preliminary pre-post and comparison group analyses. For the pre-post analyses we started with a bivariate analysis for each outcome. We then added a set of demographic characteristics. The pre-post results presented in the **Outcome Evaluation Report** additionally included two measures that were ultimately tested as potential moderators. For the comparison group analyses we started with a bivariate analysis for each outcome. The comparison group results described in **Outcome Evaluation Report** and presented in **Section F-1** additionally included a set of demographic characteristics. **Section F-4** presents a set of COVID-19 sensitivity analyses that were used to determine whether the COVID-19 pandemic affected our main findings.

F-1. COMPARISON GROUP CLINICAL AND SOCIAL FUNCTIONING OUTCOMES

Table F-1 shows the full results from the comparison group analysis. This analysis is referenced in **Outcome Evaluation Report** and uses data from the AltaPointe AOT site and a comparison group of ACT clients in Mobile and Baldwin Counties. These analyses were shown to be underpowered for many of the key outcomes in **Outcome Evaluation Report**. Accordingly, we only reference them in the main body of the report but for completeness we provide these results in full here. Broadly, as expected many outcomes are statistically non-significant reflecting the lack of statistical power.

TABLE F-1. Comparison Group Results at 6-month Follow-up, Regression-Adjusted								
	Comparison Group Baseline, mean/%	AOT Group Baseline, mean/%	Comparison Group Follow-up, mean/%	AOT Group Follow-up, mean/%	Relative Change	95% CI	P-Value	Bayes Factor
Appointment adherence, %	47.6%	84.8%	78.5%	96.1%	1.0	(-4.9, 6.8)	0.746	0.0
Medication adherence, %	43.3%	70.8%	78.8%	92.4%	3.3	(-5.5, 12.1)	0.468	0.2
MCSI score, mean	3.5	3.9	4.2	4.7	0.0	(-0.3, 0.3)	0.814	1.5
Perceived MH as excellent, %	3.9%	12.5%	9.5%	18.1%	22.9	(10.5, 35.3)	<0.001	>100
Life satisfaction score, mean	4.4	5.0	4.8	5.4	0.0	(-0.4, 0.4)	0.955	1.1
Working alliance inventory, goal scale, mean	12.4	12.3	14.8	14.7	2.3	(-0.2, 4.7)	0.066	50.8
Working alliance inventory, task scale, mean	12.3	12.3	14.8	14.8	1.9	(-0.6, 4.4)	0.129	18.6
Working alliance inventory, bond scale, mean	13.6	13.5	16.2	16.1	1.5	(-1.0, 3.9)	0.233	9.4
Any violent behavior, %	31.4%	15.7%	7.1%	3.0%	0.7	(-4.2, 5.6)	0.781	19.4
Any suicidal ideation, %	20.9%	17.5%	5.9%	4.7%	-1.9	(-7.4, 3.6)	0.498	0.5
Any MH ED visits, %	11.9%	2.9%	5.9%	1.3%	2.8	(-0.9, 6.5)	0.139	26.3
Any psychiatric IP encounters, %	68.8%	71.3%	15.1%	16.6%	-14.0	(-27.5, -0.4)	0.043	16.3
Number of psychiatric IP nights, mean	5.6	15.9	-1.2	9.1	-11.6	(-17.5, -5.7)	<0.001	>100
Any arrests in past 6 months, %	21.0%	30.4%	2.1%	3.5%	3.7	(-3.9, 11.2)	0.344	0.1
Any illicit drug use in past 6 months, %	47.4%	26.5%	25.9%	11.7%	-5.5	(-17.3, 6.4)	0.365	1.1
Any homelessness in past 6 months, %	5.4%	12.3%	3.8%	9.1%	-1.5	(-13.2, 10.2)	0.799	1.9
Notes: The following outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of the outcome: perceived MH rating is very good, any violence, and suicidal ideation. The remaining models used an ordinary least squares regression functional form. All models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, length of the AOT order. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month follow-up. Bayes factors were calculated using Bayesian analogs to the frequentist regression models using wide normal distributions for priors (i.e., with standard deviations of 100).								

F-2. SECONDARY DATA CLINICAL AND SOCIAL FUNCTIONING OUTCOMES

Table F-2 presents results from a secondary data analysis. Outcomes were chosen to provide complementary outcomes to those included in the primary data analyses. These data were derived from administrative records that each of the in-depth sites furnished. Broadly, where results were statistically significant, we found that the direction of effects were similar to those observed with the primary data analyses.

TABLE F-2. Secondary Data Analysis Results					
Outcome/ Follow-up Period	Pre-period mean/%	Post-period mean/%	Change	95% CI	P-Value
Outpatient encounters					
6 months after AOT order	1.8	2.4	0.6	(-0.7, 2.0)	0.378
12 months after AOT order	1.8	3.3	1.5	(-2.9, 5.9)	0.493
18 months after AOT order	1.8	2.0	0.2	(-2.4, 2.7)	0.891
24 months after AOT order	1.8	1.5	-0.3	(-3.0, 2.3)	0.808
Medication possession ratio, %					
6 months after AOT order	70.7%	66.8%	-3.9	(-27.8, 20.0)	0.750
12 months after AOT order	70.7%	71.2%	0.5	(-23.2, 24.1)	0.970
18 months after AOT order	70.7%	77.0%	6.2	(-23.6, 36.0)	0.682
24 months after AOT order	70.7%	69.5%	-1.2	(-43.7, 41.2)	0.954
Any crisis encounters, %					
6 months after AOT order	43.9%	46.9%	3.0	(-29.9, 35.9)	0.857
12 months after AOT order	43.9%	32.0%	-11.9	(-44.6, 20.8)	0.477
18 months after AOT order	43.9%	8.0%	-35.9	(-68.9, -2.9)	0.033
24 months after AOT order	43.9%	3.2%	-40.7	(-74.8, -6.5)	0.020
Number of crisis encounters					
6 months after AOT order	2.9	1.3	-1.6	(-4.3, 1.1)	0.234
12 months after AOT order	2.9	0.8	-2.1	(-4.8, 0.6)	0.122
18 months after AOT order	2.9	0.2	-2.7	(-5.4, -0.1)	0.046
24 months after AOT order	2.9	0.0	-2.9	(-5.6, -0.3)	0.029
Psychiatric inpatient encounters					
6 months after AOT order	7.1	1.3	-5.8	(-6.9, -4.8)	<0.001
12 months after AOT order	7.1	0.2	-6.9	(-7.2, -6.6)	<0.001
18 months after AOT order	7.1	0.2	-7.0	(-7.1, -6.8)	<0.001
24 months after AOT order	7.1	0.2	-6.9	(-7.2, -6.7)	<0.001
Number of arrests					
6 months after AOT order	1.4	0.6	-0.8	(-2.8, 1.2)	0.451
12 months after AOT order	1.4	0.7	-0.6	(-2.2, 0.9)	0.436
18 months after AOT order	1.4	0.7	-0.6	(-2.2, 0.9)	0.409
24 months after AOT order	1.4	0.7	-0.7	(-2.3, 0.9)	0.386
Notes: The following outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of the outcome: perceived MH rating is very good, any violence, and suicidal ideation. The remaining models used an ordinary least squares regression functional form. All models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, criminal justice involvement at baseline, length of the AOT order, an indicator for whether the client was stepped down from an institutional setting, and an indicator for whether the client ever appeared before the judge/magistrate for a status hearing during their AOT order. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month or 12-month follow-up.					

F-3. AOT CLIENT BIVARIATE ASSOCIATIONS AND LIMITED CONTROL RESULTS

Table F-3 presents results from our preliminary pre-post analyses. These preliminary analyses measured the bivariate associations with AOT and each outcome. We then estimated models that controlled for a limited set of covariates, including only demographic characteristics. Broadly, these results are similar to those presented in the **Outcome Evaluation Report**.

TABLE F-3. Bivariate and Limited Control Variable Specifications, Pre-post Analyses										
Outcome/Follow-up Period	Bivariate Associations					Associations after Controlling for Demographic Characteristics				
	Baseline, mean/%	Follow-up, mean/%	Change	95% CI	P-Value	Baseline, mean/%	Follow-up, mean/%	Change	95% CI	P-Value
Appointment adherence										
6-month follow-up	69.9%	93.0%	23.0	(10.9, 35.2)	<0.001	68.7%	93.1%	24.5	(12.3, 36.6)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	69.9%	90.9%	21.0	(-3.4, 45.4)	0.092	68.7%	91.3%	22.7	(-1.3, 46.6)	0.063
Medication adherence, %										
6-month follow-up	71.5%	89.1%	17.5	(6.0, 29.1)	0.003	70.7%	89.0%	18.3	(7.8, 28.8)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	71.5%	90.1%	18.6	(8.1, 29.1)	<0.001	70.7%	91.0%	20.3	(11.2, 29.4)	<0.001
MCSI score, mean										
6-month follow-up	3.7	4.4	0.6	(0.3, 1.0)	<0.001	3.8	4.4	0.6	(0.3, 0.9)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	3.7	4.6	0.8	(0.4, 1.3)	<0.001	3.8	4.5	0.8	(0.4, 1.2)	<0.001
Perceived MH as excellent, %										
6-month follow-up	13.1%	27.4%	14.3	(3.2, 25.4)	0.012	13.3%	27.5%	14.1	(4.0, 24.2)	0.006
12-month follow-up	13.1%	27.0%	13.9	(-3.3, 31.0)	0.114	13.3%	27.8%	14.5	(-2.1, 31.0)	0.087
Life satisfaction score, mean										
6-month follow-up	4.8	5.1	0.4	(0.1, 0.6)	0.005	4.8	5.1	0.3	(0.1, 0.6)	0.003
12-month follow-up	4.8	5.5	0.8	(0.3, 1.3)	0.002	4.8	5.5	0.7	(0.3, 1.2)	0.001
WAI goal scale, mean										
6-month follow-up	15.0	17.3	2.3	(0.9, 3.6)	0.001	15.0	17.3	2.3	(0.9, 3.7)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	15.0	17.6	2.6	(0.5, 4.7)	0.016	15.0	17.6	2.6	(0.5, 4.7)	0.015
WAI task scale, mean										
6-month follow-up	14.9	17.1	2.2	(0.7, 3.6)	0.003	14.9	17.1	2.2	(0.7, 3.8)	0.003
12-month follow-up	14.9	18.0	3.1	(1.4, 4.7)	<0.001	14.9	18.0	3.1	(1.5, 4.8)	<0.001
WAI bond scale, mean										
6-month follow-up	16.2	17.9	1.7	(0.3, 3.2)	0.020	16.2	17.9	1.8	(0.3, 3.2)	0.019
12-month follow-up	16.2	18.3	2.2	(0.4, 3.9)	0.016	16.2	18.4	2.2	(0.6, 3.9)	0.009
Any violent behavior, %										
6-month follow-up	24.6%	4.8%	-19.7	(-35.3, -4.2)	0.013	23.2%	5.0%	-18.2	(-33.0, -3.5)	0.016
12-month follow-up	24.6%	1.3%	-23.3	(-38.6, -8.0)	0.003	23.2%	1.5%	-21.7	(-36.2, -7.2)	0.003
Any suicidal ideation, %										
6-month follow-up	29.1%	6.6%	-22.6	(-40.6, -4.5)	0.014	30.0%	6.9%	-23.1	(-37.8, -8.4)	0.002
12-month follow-up	29.1%	4.0%	-25.1	(-43.7, -6.5)	0.008	30.0%	4.8%	-25.1	(-39.5, -10.7)	<0.001
Any MH ED visits, %										
6-month follow-up	13.5%	1.5%	-12.0	(-36.8, 12.8)	0.344	12.8%	1.7%	-11.1	(-35.5, 13.3)	0.373
12-month follow-up	13.5%	1.3%	-12.2	(-36.9, 12.5)	0.334	12.8%	1.7%	-11.1	(-35.7, 13.5)	0.375
Any psychiatric IP encounters, %										
6-month follow-up	60.1%	21.2%	-38.9	(-70.5, -7.3)	0.016	60.2%	21.0%	-39.3	(-71.9, -6.6)	0.018
12-month follow-up	60.1%	14.3%	-45.8	(-69.6, -22.1)	<0.001	60.2%	14.7%	-45.5	(-69.3, -21.7)	<0.001
Psychiatric IP nights, mean										
6-month follow-up	11.8	2.4	-9.5	(-17.3, -1.6)	0.018	12.0	2.1	-9.8	(-17.6, -2.1)	0.013
12-month follow-up	11.8	2.0	-9.8	(-16.5, -3.1)	0.004	12.0	2.4	-9.5	(-15.5, -3.6)	0.002
Any arrests in past 6 months, %										
6-month follow-up	27.0%	5.9%	-21.1	(-29.8, -12.3)	<0.001	26.2%	6.3%	-19.9	(-26.1, -13.7)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	27.0%	2.6%	-24.4	(-33.9, -14.9)	<0.001	26.2%	2.5%	-23.6	(-30.1, -17.1)	<0.001
Any illicit drug use in past 6 months, %										
6-month follow-up	28.1%	14.7%	-13.4	(-21.2, -5.5)	<0.001	27.8%	14.7%	-13.0	(-20.6, -5.5)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	28.1%	9.1%	-19.0	(-26.0, -12.0)	<0.001	27.8%	9.5%	-18.3	(-24.5, -12.0)	<0.001
Any homelessness in past 6 months, %										
6-month follow-up	16.9%	5.3%	-11.5	(-21.3, -1.7)	0.021	16.8%	5.2%	-11.6	(-21.4, -1.8)	0.020
12-month follow-up	16.9%	13.5%	-3.4	(-27.8, 21.1)	0.787	16.8%	9.0%	-7.8	(-27.6, 12.1)	0.444
Notes:										
The following outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of the outcome: perceived MH rating is very good, any violence, and suicidal ideation. The remaining models used an ordinary least squares regression functional form. All models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, criminal justice involvement at baseline, length of the AOT order, an indicator for whether the client was stepped down from an institutional setting, and an indicator for whether the client ever appeared before the judge/magistrate for a status hearing during their AOT order. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month or 12-month follow-up.										

Table F-4 presents bivariate associations using AltaPointe data and the AltaPointe comparison group. These results are similar to those presented in **Section F-1**.

TABLE F-4. Bivariate Specification, Comparison Group Analyses							
Outcome/ Follow-up Period	Comparison Group Baseline, mean/%	AOT Group Baseline, mean/%	Comparison Group Follow-up, mean/%	AOT Group Follow-up, mean/%	Relative Change	95% CI	P-Value
Appointment adherence, %	47.5%	84.8%	79.6%	96.0%	1.0	(-4.9, 6.9)	0.741
Medication adherence, %	43.8%	70.4%	80.1%	92.4%	2.9	(-5.8, 11.6)	0.508
MCSI score, mean	3.5	3.9	4.2	4.6	0.1	(-0.3, 0.4)	0.742
Perceived MH as excellent, %	3.3%	13.0%	7.8%	17.5%	25.2	(12.6, 37.8)	<0.001
Life satisfaction score, mean	4.4	5.0	4.8	5.3	0.0	(-0.4, 0.4)	0.832
WAI goal scale, mean	12.1	12.5	14.6	14.9	2.4	(-0.2, 4.9)	0.065
WAI task scale, mean	12.1	12.4	14.6	14.9	2.1	(-0.5, 4.8)	0.106
WAI bond scale, mean	13.4	13.7	15.9	16.2	1.7	(-1.0, 4.3)	0.225
Any violent behavior, %	31.3%	15.7%	7.0%	3.0%	0.5	(-4.4, 5.5)	0.830
Any suicidal ideation, %	23.3%	15.4%	6.4%	3.9%	-2.3	(-8.0, 3.5)	0.439
Any MH ED visits, %	10.5%	3.4%	4.5%	1.4%	2.6	(-1.4, 6.6)	0.209
Any psychiatric IP encounters, %	70.9%	69.3%	16.0%	15.0%	-14.4	(-28.0, -0.7)	0.040
Number of psychiatric IP nights, mean	5.9	15.6	-0.8	8.9	-11.8	(-18.0, -5.6)	<0.001
Any arrests in past 6 months, %	18.4%	33.7%	1.7%	3.8%	3.7	(-3.9, 11.2)	0.341
Any illicit drug use in past 6 months, %	46.5%	27.0%	23.6%	11.6%	-3.7	(-14.4, 7.0)	0.498
Any homelessness in past 6 months, %	6.6%	9.9%	6.9%	10.4%	-5.6	(-20.3, 9.1)	0.455
Notes: Both outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of being either appointment or medication adherent. Models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, criminal justice involvement at baseline, length of the AOT order, and an indicator for whether the client was stepped down from an institutional setting. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month or 12-month follow-up.							

F-5. COVID-19 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS FOR CLINICAL AND SOCIAL FUNCTIONING OUTCOMES

Table F-5 and **Table F-6** presents results from a COVID sensitivity analysis for clinical and social functioning outcomes of AOT client with and without the comparison group analysis. While many of the results presented below are slightly more robust than those reported in the main chapter, they are qualitatively similar in terms of direction and significance.

TABLE F-5. COVID-19 Sensitivity Analysis for AOT Clients, Without Comparison Group					
Outcome/ Follow-up Period	Baseline, mean/%	Follow-up, mean/%	Change	95% CI	P-Value
Appointment adherence					
6-month follow-up	59.1%	93.7%	34.7	(25.2, 44.1)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	59.1%	91.3%	32.3	(5.6, 59.0)	0.018
Medication adherence, %					
6-month follow-up	65.1%	88.7%	23.6	(13.0, 34.2)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	65.1%	95.4%	30.3	(22.4, 38.1)	<0.001
MCSI score, mean					
6-month follow-up	3.7	4.5	0.7	(0.5, 1.0)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	3.7	4.7	0.9	(0.5, 1.3)	<0.001

TABLE F-5 (continued)					
Outcome/ Follow-up Period	Baseline, mean/%	Follow-up, mean/%	Change	95% CI	P-Value
Perceived MH rating is very good, %					
6-month follow-up	13.1%	32.3%	19.2	(11.3, 27.2)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	13.1%	41.9%	28.8	(5.5, 52.1)	0.016
Life satisfaction					
6-month follow-up	4.6	5.2	0.6	(0.2, 1.0)	0.002
12-month follow-up	4.6	5.5	0.8	(0.0, 1.6)	0.038
WAI goal scale, mean					
6-month follow-up	14.6	17.4	2.7	(1.2, 4.3)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	14.6	17.5	2.9	(1.0, 4.8)	0.002
WAI task scale, mean					
6-month follow-up	14.4	17.2	2.8	(0.9, 4.6)	0.004
12-month follow-up	14.4	17.6	3.2	(1.3, 5.1)	0.001
WAI bond scale, mean					
6-month follow-up	15.8	17.9	2.1	(0.5, 3.7)	0.010
12-month follow-up	15.8	18.6	2.8	(1.1, 4.5)	0.002
Any violent behavior, %					
6-month follow-up	25.7%	4.6%	-21.1	(-37.5, -4.7)	0.012
12-month follow-up	na	na	na	na	na
Any suicidal ideation, %					
6-month follow-up	32.6%	3.0%	-29.6	(-47.6, -11.5)	0.001
12-month follow-up	32.6%	3.0%	-29.7	(-47.1, -12.2)	<0.001
Any MH ED visits, %					
6-month follow-up	19.5%	0.6%	-18.8	(-50.0, 12.3)	0.236
12-month follow-up	na	na	na	na	na
Any psychiatric IP encounters, %					
6-month follow-up	62.9%	25.5%	-37.5	(-74.8, -0.2)	0.049
12-month follow-up	62.9%	10.0%	-53.0	(-83.0, -23.0)	<0.001
Number of psychiatric IP nights, mean					
6-month follow-up	12.1	2.0	-10.1	(-17.9, -2.3)	0.011
12-month follow-up	12.1	1.6	-10.5	(-17.1, -3.9)	0.002
Any arrests in past 6 months, %					
6-month follow-up	24.1%	7.3%	-16.7	(-19.0, -14.4)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	na	na	na	na	na
Any illicit drug use in past 6 months, %					
6-month follow-up	29.8%	15.7%	-14.1	(-21.5, -6.7)	<0.001
12-month follow-up	29.8%	5.2%	-24.6	(-32.3, -16.8)	<0.001
Any homelessness in past 6 months, %					
6-month follow-up	19.5%	5.8%	-13.7	(-23.5, -3.9)	0.006
12-month follow-up	na	na	na	na	na
Notes:					
The following outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of the outcome: perceived MH rating is very good, any violence, and suicidal ideation. The remaining models used an ordinary least squares regression functional form. All models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, criminal justice involvement at baseline, length of the AOT order, an indicator for whether the client was stepped down from an institutional setting, and an indicator for whether the client ever appeared before the judge/magistrate for a status hearing during their AOT order. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month or 12-month follow-up.					

TABLE F-6. COVID Sensitivity Analysis with Comparison Group							
Outcome/ Follow-up Period	Comparison Group Baseline, mean/%	AOT Group Baseline, mean/%	Comparison Group Follow-up, mean/%	AOT Group Follow-up, mean/%	Relative Change	95% CI	P-Value
Appointment adherence, %	47.5%	81.1%	81.3%	95.3%	4.0	(-2.9, 10.9)	0.254
Medication adherence, %	43.8%	71.1%	78.1%	91.9%	1.5	(-8.6, 11.5)	0.777
MCSI score, mean	3.5	3.9	4.2	4.6	0.1	(-0.2, 0.4)	0.585
Perceived MH as excellent, %	3.3%	12.2%	7.5%	16.4%	31.2	(16.2, 46.2)	<0.001
Life satisfaction score, mean	4.4	4.9	4.8	5.3	0.3	(-0.2, 0.7)	0.252
WAI goal scale, mean	12.1	12.5	14.4	14.8	2.8	(0.1, 5.4)	0.039
WAI task scale, mean	12.1	12.3	14.5	14.7	2.7	(0.0, 5.4)	0.048
WAI bond scale, mean	13.4	13.7	15.8	16.1	1.9	(-0.8, 4.7)	0.168
Any violent behavior, %	31.3%	15.2%	7.2%	3.0%	0.6	(-5.2, 6.3)	0.850
Any suicidal ideation, %	23.3%	16.4%	6.7%	4.4%	-3.3	(-9.8, 3.3)	0.326
Any MH emergency room visits, %	10.5%	2.8%	3.4%	0.9%	1.1	(-2.6, 4.7)	0.564
Any psychiatric IP encounters, %	70.9%	70.4%	17.0%	16.7%	-12.2	(-27.5, 3.1)	0.117
Number of psychiatric IP nights, mean	5.9	16.6	-0.3	10.4	-12.6	(-20.0, -5.3)	<0.001
Any arrests in past 6 months, %	18.4%	34.8%	1.6%	3.8%	3.6	(-5.2, 12.5)	0.419
Any illicit drug use in past 6 months, %	46.5%	28.2%	24.5%	12.8%	-5.3	(-17.6, 7.1)	0.406
Any homelessness in past 6 months, %	6.6%	12.3%	6.5%	12.2%	-5.4	(-22.5, 11.8)	0.540
Notes: The following outcomes used a logistic regression to model the probability of the outcome: perceived MH rating is very good, any violence, and suicidal ideation. The remaining models used an ordinary least squares regression functional form. All models controlled for the following confounders: gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, parenthood, education, indicators for in school or employed, criminal justice involvement at baseline, length of the AOT order, an indicator for whether the client was stepped down from an institutional setting, and an indicator for whether the client ever appeared before the judge/magistrate for a status hearing during their AOT order. Marginal effects were calculated so that all estimates are interpreted as the percentage point change in the outcome observed at 6-month or 12-month follow-up.							