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Reviewer's report:
Thank-you for asking me to review this paper. I read the paper with great interest.

The topic of use of psychotropic medications in older people in care homes is an important topic.

The study is large and provides detailed analysis of the data. The limitations of the study are carefully outlined in the paper.

I would suggest some minor modifications, as follows:

Throughout the term 'poorer' should be replaced with 'lower'.

On page for, line 91, it would help the reader to define the two care models or to signpost to the later descriptions.

On Page 5, line 110, please explain 'participate on behalf of the resident'. Doe this mean relatives completed the assessments for the participants?

On page 7, lines 148-165- please specify number of subjects in the cottage model homes and the number in the traditional homes.

On page 10, line 243- is there any evidence of the residents in the cottage model being at an earlier stage in their dementia or more independent? Possibly these are aspects that require
further research? The authors might then be a little more specific about the further research needed?

similarly pages 11-12, the authors might suggest why the cottage model works better e.g., more staff, smaller groups of residents, more homogeneous groups of residents, more to do? Again this would help to establish what further research is needed to advance the evidence base for residential dementia care.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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