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**Reviewer’s report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

This manuscript provides a conceptual review of institutionalization in mental health care.

Overall, the paper would be improved by folding in the timeline throughout the discussion of the various themes with some critique, as opposed to having a brief section before the discussion. On a very superficial level, the reader will be immediately struck by the patterning presented in Table 1. For example, there is a striking absence of attention to patients’ adaptive behaviour to care in the majority of studies from the mid-1980s, whereas attention to policy and legal frameworks increased dramatically after 2000. Beyond the superficial, there could be a very useful critique provided about this alongside discussion of shifting ideologies, conceptualisations and policies already present in the manuscript.

The discussion of the policy and legal frameworks needs further development. For example, there is a brief mention of the Mental Health Act in the UK, but no information about the act or any comparisons with similar legislation in the other countries. Also, the authors need to provide a more in-depth discussion of how mental capacity factors into this area.

Throughout the manuscript the authors present various models/arguments by researchers focusing on various aspects of institutionalisation, but fail to offer any useful critique. Any critical analysis is contained to a short section in the discussion section. The differentiation between offering a conceptual versus theoretically focused review should not preclude the authors from providing a more analytic review. Adding this element would take this thoughtful work to the level of being thought-provoking.
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