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Reviewer’s Report

Minor Issues Not for Publication
1. Manuscript page 4, line 88, I question use of the word “peculiar” in this context.
2. Manuscript page 7, line 167, I would change “The external investigators did neither have” to “The external investigators neither had”.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Background, para. 4, Provide citation to the new Swiss legal act.
2. Data Collection, para. 3, Because not all readers will be familiar with BESA and RAI, I suggest spelling out these terms or otherwise providing a small amount of explanation.
3. Ethical Considerations, I think you are trying to say that no individual resident was identified by name in the data collection and analysis process, but I suggest stating this more explicitly.
4. Discussion, para. 2, I suggest changing “Therefore, we assume” to something softer such as “Therefore, one might assume”. Some readers might question this assumption.
5. Strengths and Limitations, I would add two more limitations. First, the nursing homes were drawn from only two cantons. (Even if they were from culturally different regions, they still may not be representative of the whole country). Second, this study represents a snapshot taken at one point in time, so it doesn’t give us a longitudinal picture.
6. Conclusion, para. 2, Consider discussing what your results say about the vigor with which the new law on restraints is (or is not) being enforced. Would better enforcement of this law be a possible intervention effective in reducing restraint use?
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