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Author's response to reviews: see over
We thank the two reviewers for their helpful comments.

Reviewer 1 (MK):
Minor points:
1-1. The authors have made revision that addressed my previous concerns. This reviewer was satisfied to see the statistic analysis in Table 3 (Model IV) in which authors have tried to adjust for the institutionalization. However, some explanations should be added in the method section. Or at least should describe in the table foot-note that the participants who were institutionalized during the follow-up as a censored sample at the moment of being institutionalized, although the reviewer recognized some explanations were made in the revised discussion.

Thank you for pointing this out. We are sorry that our revision might be confusing.

For the analyses for Table 3, we dealt with the care recipients who were institutionalized during the follow-up NOT as censored at the moment of institutionalization. This is because we still believe that the effect of informal care-giving arrangement persists even after the care recipients became institutionalized as stated in p11, ll15-19.

On the other hand, for the extra analysis written in the Revised Discussion (p11, ll19 – p12, 11), we dealt with the care recipients who were institutionalized during the follow-up as censored at the moment of institutionalization. This is because the idea that the care recipients who were institutionalized would rather be censored at the moment of institutionalization can also be reasonable.

This way, we put the former method into Methods & Result section, and put the latter method into Discussion section (as an extra analysis) in order to avoid the misunderstanding between two different methods of censoring. However, we could conclude that these two different methods of censoring could reach the same interpretation in the end, because our finding from these two methods looked not different (p11, ll24 – p12, ll1).

Based on the thought stated above, we corrected several sentences in Discussion section (p11, ll19-22) to avoid misunderstanding: “As an extra analysis complying with another interpretation that there is no latency/induction period, we dealt with the care recipients who were institutionalized as censored at the moment of being institutionalized in addition to the care recipients who were moved out from the municipality.”
1-2. There are some typographical errors in revised discussion.(p11, line 12, footnote in Table 3)

Thank you for pointing this out.

Once again, we thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments. We feel that our paper is improved again as a result of making these changes, and we hope that our paper can now be accepted for publication.

Yours sincerely