Table F19. Key Question 2: criminal justice outcomes

| Study | Group | Outcome | N at Pre‑treatment/ Total N in Group (%) | N at Final Followup/ Total N in Group (%) | EPC-Calculated Between-Group Effect Size Odds Ratio (95% CI), p‑Value | Author Reported Results |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Theurer and Lovell, 200878 | MIOCTP (64) | New felony | NA | 15/64 (23%) | OR 0.42 (95% CI 0.20 to 0.90) p=0.03 | McNemar Test:, chi-square=5.5, p=0.01, OR 0.3, 3.4 |
| Residential mental health program residency while in prison; TAU upon release (64) | NA | 27/64 (42%) |
| MIOCTP (64) | Any new offense | NA | 25/64 (39%) | OR: 0.41 (0.20 to 0.84) p=0.01 | McNemar Test:, p=0.003, OR 0.22, 4.5 |
| Residential mental health program residency while in prison; TAU upon release (64) | NA | 39/64 (61%) |

| Table F19. Key Question 2: criminal justice outcomes (continued) | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Group** | **Outcome** | **N at Pre‑treatment/ Total N in Group (%)** | **N at Final Followup/ Total N in Group (%)** | **EPC-Calculated Between-Group Effect Size Odds Ratio (95% CI), p‑Value** | **Author Reported Results** |
| Chandler and Spicer, 200681 | Jail followed by high-fidelity IDDT (103) | Time to first rearrest and percent rearrested | NA | Data presented in survival graph form. | Could not be calculated. | RR: 0.94, (95% CI 0.67 to 1.35) p=0.75 |
|  | Jail followed by TAU (79) | Time to first rearrest and percent rearrested | NA | Data presented in survival graph form. |
|  | Jail followed by high-fidelity IDDT (103) | Total arrests at 20 months | NA | Data presented in graph form. | Could not be calculated. | IDDT participants had a nonsignificant lower sum of arrests than did control participants (z=1.131, p<0.189) |
|  | Jail followed by TAU (79) | Total arrests at 20 months | NA | Data presented in graph form. |
|  | Jail followed by high-fidelity IDDT (103) | Arrests (per person year) | 2.89 | 2.21 | Could not be calculated. | IDDT: Sign rank test of difference within group: -0.68, p<0.01  TAU: Sign rank test of difference within group: -0.23, p≥0.05  Nonsignificant difference between groups |
|  | Jail followed by TAU (79) | Arrests (per person year) | 2.84 | 2.61 |
| Chandler and Spicer , 200681 (continued) | Jail followed by high- fidelity IDDT (103) | Any conviction (per person years) | 0.69 | 0.59 | Could not be calculated. | IDDT: Sign rank test of difference within group: -0.10, p<0.05  Nonsignificant difference between groups  TAU: Sign rank test of difference within group:0.12, p≥0.05 |
|  | Jail followed by TAU (79) | Any conviction (per person years) | 0.61 | 0.73 |
|  | Jail followed by high- fidelity IDDT (103) | Felony conviction (per person years) | 0.29 | 0.31 | Could not be calculated. | IDDT: Sign rank test of difference within group: 0.02, p≥0.05  TAU: Sign rank test of difference within group: 0.03, p≥0.05  Nonsignificant difference between groups |
|  | Jail followed by TAU (79) | Felony conviction (per person years) | 0.25 | 0.28 |
| Jail followed by high-fidelity IDDT (103) | Jail days (per person years) | 96.74 | 60.71 | Could not be calculated. | IDDT: Sign rank test of difference within group: -36.03, p<0.01  TAU: Sign rank test of difference within group: -20.05, p<0.01  Nonsignificant between group difference |
| Jail followed by TAU (79) | Jail days (per person years) | 79.43 | 59.39 |
| Jail followed by high-fidelity IDDT (103) | Mean incarcerations | NA | Mean: 2.2 (NR) | Could not be calculated. | Author statistics: z=1.97, p<0.049 |
| Jail followed by TAU (79) | Mean incarcerations | NA | Mean: 2.8 (NR) |
| Jail followed by high- fidelity IDDT (103) | Mean jail stay (days) | NA | Mean: 59.4 (NR) | Could not be calculated. | Author statistics: z=1.97, p<0.051 |
| Jail followed by TAU (79) | Mean jail stay (days) | NA | Mean: 43.3 (NR) |
| Solomon and Draine, 199583 | ACT (37) | Return to jai within one year | NA | 22 (60.0%) | Forensic ICM vs. ACT: 0.46 (0.18 to 1.17) p=0.10  Forensic ICM vs. TAU: 1.17 (0.39 to 3.51) p=0.78 | No statistically significant difference |
| Forensic ICM (35) | Return to jail within one year | NA | 14 (40.0%) |
| TAU (22) | Return to jail within one year | NA | 8 (36.0%) |
| Coid et al., 200780 | Forensic specialist psychiatric services (409) | Any re-offense | NA | 477/2078 | OR: 0.79 (0.70 to 0.90) p<0.000 | Regression analysis, with potential confounders adjusted for, Incidence Rate Ratio 1.16 (95% CI, 0.94 to 1.43) |
| General adult psychiatric services (652) | Any re-offense | NA | 845/3086 |
| Van Stelle and Moberg, 200482 | MICA therapeutic community in prison and in community following release from prison: (103) | Arrest within 3 months | NA | 29/103 (28%) | OR: 0.63 (0.32 to 1.27) p=0.20 | Not significant. |
| TAU (55) | Arrest within 3 months | NA | 21/55 (38%) |
| MICA therapeutic community in prison and in community following release from prison: (103) | Returned to prison within 3 months of release | NA | 21/103 (22%) | OR: 0.49 (0.37 to 0.88) p=0.01 | Chi-square or one-way ANOVA significant at p<0.05. |
| TAU (55) | Returned to prison within 3 months of release | NA | 19/55 (34%) |

ACT=Assertive community treatment; ANOVA=analysis of variance; CI=confidence interval; ICM=intensive case management; IDDT=integrated dual diagnosis treatment; MICA=mentally ill chemical abuser; MIOCTP=Mentally Ill Offender Community Transition Program; N=number; NA=not applicable; NR=not reported; OR=odds ratio; RR=relative risk; TAU=treatment as usual