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Reviewer's report:

'A cross-sectional study to compare care needs of individuals with and without dementia in residential homes in the Netherlands'

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS NEEDED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Partially. It would be helpful to have more context that describes why comparing needs & unmet needs between resident with/without dementia is an important question. What is the long-term goal for using the findings from this study?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Partially. Authors need to explain the 3 groups—who are these groups. More information on reliability and validity evidence for the measure would be helpful. Specifically, has this measure been used with dementia populations in the past? Also, what were the reliability and validity statistics/methods used in this study with this measure? Would be helpful to have more information on how inter-rater reliability among data collectors was achieved.

3. Are the data sound?
   The data appear sound to a point. However, the design is weak—use of a single self-report measure to elicit residents' perceptions of their met/unmet needs. Given the various factors that could influence participant responses, this seems like a limited way to collect data on the two populations—it would be helpful to use additional data collection methods such as chart documentation, observation, or staff surveys.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Partially. See #3 above

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   I would like to see discussion of both practice and research implications of the study findings. What should happen next? It would be helpful to have more contextual information on why the study was conducted—why these two groups (cognitively impaired/not) were compared. How will the findings be used?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Partially—please see my notes in the manuscript margin.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
I’m not certain as I am not an expert in this area. However, of the 22 citations, only two are 2008 and none are more recent. Several citations are missing publication date information. These need to be dated. Also, the authors might want to review the literature for more recent publications related to the issue of met/unmet needs of residents with dementia in residential care.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
YES

9. Is the writing acceptable?
YES. I am always in awe of people who conduct research in one language and publish papers in another language!

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
In the margins I have identified several areas where the authors may want to select another word or rewrite a sentence for clarity. Also, there are minor grammatical errors scattered throughout—not a lot.

I HAVE NO REASON TO BELIEVE THAT DUPLICATION OR PLAGIARISM HAPPENED IN THIS PAPER

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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