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**Reviewer's report:**

I agree with Referee 1 that this is a descriptive study and as such don’t think they can address her concerns without doing significantly more work, which I don’t believe is necessary.

I think the biggest limitation of this research is the low response rate from Germany. I disagree with the authors on their “interpretation” of these low rates, as well as with their “rationalization” of this data.

I would like to see a comparison of the range of hospitals surveyed in each country to that of the entire country, as opposed to simply comparing the ranges between the two countries. While it is reassuring that the between country comparison is similar, if there is a large difference in the range of hospitals in the country to that of the respondents from that country, I would be very reluctant to accept this paper. If these ranges are similar, I would tend to believe the data.

I would also like to see the authors make it clear that many of their findings, for example, the increased number of PCs on units in Austria could just as easily be a result of increased use of CISs rather than a cause of this. In other words, I don’t think they can make any “cause and effect” declarations in this paper. I would really like them to make this more clearly a descriptive paper, and stop with all the philosophizing regarding the importance of the differences in laws or use of NANDA to account for the increased use of CISs in Austria. Again, I don’t know what caused what here. I suppose they can describe these differences in the discussion, but again, these need to be clearly laid out as musings rather than statements of cause and effect.