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Author's response to reviews:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. English is not the native language of the authors. While their skills in developing this manuscript in English are very impressive, the manuscript needs to be proofed by a technical editor with expertise in both the Dutch and English (UK version) languages. There are numerous technical errors and the writing style is at times awkward and distracting to the reader (verb tenses). Also, correct formatting of numbers in text needs to be edited throughout.

REPLY: We edited the paper with near native English speaking research colleagues. We hope the writing has improved.

2. The 'N' for the proxy participants is identified as 36 and 57 in different paragraphs on pg 7. The authors need to decide which number is correct or explain the differences.

REPLY: 36 proxies participated and 57 proxies did not. We have made this difference more explicit in the text.

3. Participants are sometimes referred to as having 'probable' dementia (e.g., the abstract); mostly as having dementia. This is confusing. The authors need to decide which term they will use and be consistent.

REPLY: We now only used the term residents with dementia.

Discretionary revision

1. For the section labelled 'Measures and measurements,' I suggest that the authors re-order the discussion of the measures as follows:

1. Dementia
2. CANE
3. GARS
4. demographics

REPLY: We changed the order of this section accordingly.