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PDF covering letter
The following modifications have been introduced in our paper “Use of neuroleptics in a General Hospital” in order to address the concerns of the reviewers:

**REVIEWER 1**

1. We introduced more data about the way we had choose the controls. We correct a mistake in the range of age (is 42 nor 20, to 104)
2. We matched by age (±10 y), age, date and department in which they were admitted. We did not matched by diagnoses because. There were not a large number of potential controls using these conditions. We have explain that better now in the methods.
3. The phrases “independent predictor” and “independent correlates” had been changed and now we have used the term “predictor”
4. The diagnosis was based on the clinical judgement of the examining physician (RB) but we do not used any formal test. There is one of the problems of the retrospective studies. We assumed a bias with this diagnosis, and we explain it in the discussion.
5. The requirements of the reviewer have been accomplished.
6. Yes, the odds-ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated from the regression coefficients
7. The requirements of the reviewer have been accomplished
8. The requirements of the reviewer have been accomplished
9. Age was taken linearly (on logistic scale)
10. We think that besides our rate is lower than in other studies, it is a high rate in a general hospital, moreover if most of the patients do not have neurological examination.

*Discretionary revisions.*

The suggestions of the reviewer have been accomplished

**REVIEWER 2**

*Discretionary revisions.*

The suggestions of the reviewer have been accomplished

*Compulsory revisions*

1. More methodological details are included in the abstract
2. We are included some adverse outcomes and one reference
3. There was a mistake in the ranges of age, the range in the cases was 40-103 and in the controls 51-96. The criteria of inclusion was people more than 18 years, but more of our cases and our controls were people with more than 60 years, really only two cases and two controls were younger than 60.
4. In Table 1 we are included demographics data
5. Dementia diagnosis is not based on standard criteria, this is one of our main methodological problems and we explain it in the discussion.
6. Dementia diagnosis at admission and three months after were done with the same procedure, and for the same person (RB). This is now presented in the text, in the methods section
7. The incidence of dementia is high even with a short follow-up period.
8. The end of the discussion has been changed
9. The minor points have been corrected