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Reviewer's report:

The Manuscript “Long-term use of antipsychotic drugs among people with dementia living in specialized care units” by Maria Gustafsson1, Stig Karlsson and Hugo Lövheim is a retrospective study that describe the prevalence, associated factors and long term use of antipsychotic drugs among people with dementia living in specialized care units. The authors assess that there is a large use of antipsychotic drugs among these patients and that during the period being evaluated (six months) there have been no change in the treatment (i.e. dose). They also observed that the long term use is not in line with current recommendations, according to which treatment should be time-limited and regularly reviewed.

The paper is clear and well written. However I suggest to make some modifications.

Major points

1) Authors obviously do not agree with the current use of antipsychotic drugs among people with dementia living in specialized care units. In my opinion they should make clearer their opinion starting from the manuscript’s title.

2) They probably should go further and investigate the reasons why after 6 months 10 persons in the group without antipsychotic start to take the drugs: this could reinforce author’s statements.

3) One of the methodological limitations could potentially affect authors’ conclusions. In fact they don’t exactly know if there have been other reasons than BPSD for prescribing antipsychotic. Authors should further investigate into this feature.

4) Discussion could be improved: authors suggest that there are other possibilities for treating BPSD in persons with dementia and about pharmacological treatment they mentioned some drugs and give some references (27-33). I suggests to improve the discussion highlighting the main points of these papers: this could reinforce their conclusions and point of view. Otherwise they just report a questionable condition without suggesting any possible change.

Minor points

1) There are some typing errors: pag 4 and 12: Reference 14, 15 and 26
respectively are written in superscript.
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