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**Reviewer's report:**

The manuscript has improved a lot. Statistical errors have been corrected and several parts of the text have been clarified. Therefore the article can be accepted. I do still advise some minor changes to correct the remaining, minor mistakes.

minor essential revisions

**Introduction:**

1) 'The overall amount of multidisciplinary treatment in SNFs is ...' for how many patients or beds?

2) Research showed that patients receiving a program ... others patients SHOULD BE other patients

**Methods**

1) measurements: From the medical records...
I think it should be patients' IN STEAD OF patient's.

**Discretionary revisions**

A major part of the discussion is on topics related to your research, yet, not on your topic. Also on the conclusions you go beyond the conclusions which can be drawn from your results. That way it seems that the implications of your part of the GRAMPS study do not have enough power to be published separately. It would be good if you could convince the readers more by really clearly stating the implications for practice and for research.

In table 1 it would be helpful for readers who are not familiar with the scales, to add the range of the scales as you did in the methods section.

In table 2 it would be helpful for readers to have the terms 'poor' and 'good' added to the cluster numbers, since you use the terms throughout the manuscript.
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