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Reviewers report:

Many thanks to the authors for addressing some of the comments that I made on the previous version. While the majority of the comments have been addressed, I still feel that the sample size calculation is not very clear. There are three levels for this trial in my understanding:

1. residential setting
2. staff (assumed to be two) at residential settings
3. patients with challenging behaviours at residential settings

It is not clear how these levels are sample, and what the ICC of 0.10 relates to.

Indeed the sample size calculation section seems to suggest that randomisation is at staff level as it says 189 staff are needed... As this is a cluster randomised trial it needs to compute the number of clusters needed i.e. number of residential settings per arm as described in the other parts of the manuscript.

The adverse events section still does not give any particular examples of AEs and SAEs. This is important for readers as well as the investigators. Kindly provide some example AEs and how they will be captured in the trial.

Kindly proof-read the manuscript as there appear to be some minor spelling / grammatical errors.
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