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Reviewer's report:

This paper concerns gender differences among patients that have been coerced and that suffer from schizophrenia. The use of coercion is an important topic in clinical psychiatry. It is a major strength of the paper that this is a multinational/multi-site study, but this might also be a challenge with respect to comparison of the data from the different sites. I believe this is an interesting paper, but that some issues need to be clarified before a decision can be made. I have several questions (‘major compulsory revisions’) that the authors should address/consider, especially relating to the methods.

Introduction
1. Do the different countries included in the study have similar legal provisions for the use of coercion? What are the implications for the study?

Methods
2. How reliable were the diagnoses? Did you independently verify the diagnoses of the patients or were these data taken directly from medical records?
3. Do you know if there might be differences in how schizophrenia is diagnosed in the different countries that participated? If so, might this have consequences for your study?
4. Did you differentiate between forced medication as an emergency procedure and forced long-term (i.e. depot) medication?
5. Did physical restraint include holding by staff?
6. You mention consent-procedures but who performed the ethical review of the study?
7. Regarding the analysis: Have you considered including a control sample of non-coerced patients with schizophrenia and to see which of your predictors (including gender) that predict the use of coercion?

Results/Discussion/Conclusion
8. Some key-numbers of the overall sample should be included.
9. The response rate seems to be 41%? How does this impact your results? Was the response/consent-rate consistent across the sample?
10. Does the study have any clinical implications? The authors briefly mention ‘targeted treatments’ and ‘appropriate consideration’ but do not give any concrete examples of how the results could be utilized/relevant clinically.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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