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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting study that investigated an important area in relation to understanding organisational characteristics of person-centred care (PCC) environments. It is an area that is of interest in relation to implementation of person-centred care in residential aged care settings.

The study has been well-designed with a valid justification of its importance and significance. The authors should be commended for the design, justification and methodological approach to the study.

My main concern is in relation to the information included in the background section and, therefore, the discussion section. In the background the authors equivocate about the effects of person-centred care in residential settings. They present PCC as if it is merely a theoretical proposition, with the use of terms such as, 'in theory', 'can enable', 'it has been suggested'. There is a lack of reference to a number of controlled studies in which the effects of PCC were investigated. I attach list of these studies in order that the authors can incorporate the findings of these studies into the background, and subsequently into the discussion. While it is true that the organisational arrangements that are required to successfully implement PCC require further investigation (and thus the valid justification for the authors’ current study), these studies provide sufficient evidence as the benefits of PCC.

Some further suggestions include:

The description of the sample, presented on page 7, is customarily presented in the results section.

It is customary to report psychometric properties of instruments that were used, therefore these should be reported, especially in relation to the P-CAT, as this measure was central to the study.

The citation for PASW on page 9, line 19, is incomplete as this is a registered trademark and should include a complete citation within the text.

Page 12, line 19, is a good example of the lack of incorporation of controlled studies (as mentioned previously in this review). The claim that 'it has reported that staff perceive…' needs
further information because resource implications of PCC have been investigated (see Chenoweth et al, 2009, 2014 on attached reference list).

Some discussion of the limitation of measuring staff perceptions through the use of P-CAT should be included.

Grammatical errors include:

Page 4, line 13, 'regard this' should be 'regard these'.
Page 8, line 1, 'Data was' should be 'Data were'.
Page 11, line 16, should read 'size, and one staff characteristic'.
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