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Reviewer’s report:

General

This study uses the Beers Criteria to examine medication in a selection of long-term care facilities in Japan. While similar assessments have been made many times in the US, comparative data from most other countries is lacking. Such data could be helpful for many purposes both in Japan and elsewhere.

This study has been conducted in a large and well-representative sample of nursing homes that reflects national nursing home demographics. The criteria have been applied cleanly, and the methods are sound. Data on diagnoses are as good as can be expected within a long-term care sample. The results are well stated. The paper is well written and without ambiguities.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I can make only two minor suggestions. The first is to leave out the summary of regression analysis from the abstract. Without better understanding the variables included and the approach taken (as is accomplished later) the findings seem odd, as they are not really predictive variables. Indeed, even within the full discussion, the results are a bit odd because variables such as total cost are not particularly useful either clinically or for policy. The authors might discuss the significance and usefulness of the findings of their regression in such a light.

The second issue is the discussion of measured outcomes of hospitalizations and falls covered in one paragraph in the discussion. Those results are not appropriately developed and seem tangential to the paper’s methods and purpose. I suggest removing this discussion. If the authors have enough information here, they should consider a separate paper on validation that would better explain the methods and results.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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