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My comments

Identifying relevant pain assessment methods/scales for people with dementia (PWD) is important for both research and clinical use. The efforts of the authors have been contributed to this “meta-review” are highly appreciated. However, unlike a mate-review on mate-analysis papers, advanced statistical analyses can be used to generate stronger evidence based on the data extracted from different RCTs. As narrative synthesis approach has been used as a major method to analyze the data identifying from other reviews, it is more like a summary. I think the added values of this mate-review should be emphasized in the background of this paper. The major findings/values of this mate-review should be discussed and highlighted in different parts throughout the entire paper.

Background:
• The added values of this mate-review need to be emphasized.
• Line 92: The authors have commented that no concordant recommendations of suitable pain tools for PID could be reached within this set of reviews. If this is the case, this is doubted that any consensus can be achieved in this mete-review based on the same set of review papers.

Methods:
• It is seems that the answers of these questions can be obtained by reviewing another systemic reviews of pain assessment tools for PWD. A mate-review should be able to provide more in-depth analyses, stronger evidence on the related topics.

Result and discussion
• Line 275: Would that cause any problem of “reviewers’ classification of the observational tool varied”? How would this affect the process of identifying the most appropriated pain tools for PWD? Any recommendations from the authors?
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