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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is an interesting paper presenting highly relevant research which has implications for both future research and practice. I was impressed with the explanations of terms that people from other fields may be unfamiliar with. However in its current form, the manuscript is too long. You may loose readers who have less of an interest in your topic than I do. I include some suggestions below:

Your Introduction is too long. For a geriatric journal you can probably summarise the numbers regarding prevalence in one paragraph: most readers are familiar with the problem. I don’t think it is necessary to separate numbers for developing and developed countries as this is not related to your study aim.

I suggest rewriting the whole Results section: you discuss your results in your Discussion as well and those sections actually present you results clearer than your Results section. Also you present a lot of new results in your Discussion (and also your Abstract) that should be in your Results section. Consider if you need the qualitative data: does it add much to your other data? Also is the satisfaction outcome measure of great interest: most people will say their are satisfied when asked? A paragraph like “The proportion of trials...” on page 21 is not necessary, you can refer to your tables in the text when you discuss what they present. The Results section may benefit from the use of subheadings.

Discussion: Move all new results to your Results section. Start with a brief summary of your results, 1 or 2 paragraphs only. Discuss the limitations to your study (as you have done, but move this section forward). Compare your results to other studies. Describe the implications of your findings for future research (what other objects that are used on a daily basis, could be tested using your methodology?) and for practice (which faucets do you recommend for use in certain settings?). I think the Discussion should be half the size that it is now.

Minor Compulsory Revisions

4. There are some minor typos/ words missing throughout the manuscript:
page 6, halfway: add the word ‘a’ to ‘as satisfaction is reflection’
page 7, first sentence of second paragraph: is impact the correct word? Should this be impair?
page 14, halfway: ‘then it is likely requires too much effort’, delete ‘is’
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

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