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Reviewer's report:

The authors address an important topic that is often discussed namely HRQoL in dementia. I have some major concerns about the overall quality of the manuscript. Please consider the following suggestions for improvement. I have listed them per section. I encourage the authors to restructure the paper and include some clear research questions.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Page numbers are missing.

Minor Essential Revisions

Method.
1. “Interviews were conducted with both study participants and their caregivers”. Which caregivers, Informal caregivers?
2. Did participants had an formal diagnoses of dementia?
3. Why were participants with an MMSE below 10 excluded?
4. What information as retrieved from the caregivers?
5. Add paragraph analysis instead of psychometric evaluation. Be explicit; indicate how the psychometrics are assessed. It is not sufficient to mention standard methods were used.
6. On the other hand it is not needed to explain the types of validity. It is more valuable to mention how they were assessed.
7. “Written informed consent was obtained from all participants if possible.” Please explain the if possible?

Results.
8. Start with a description of the sample before findings are presented. Please make sure that tables and text are not redundant.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Abstract needs revision. Please delete the first two sentences. These are not important in relation to the aim of the manuscript. However the aim remains a little unclear. The method section of the abstract lacks information. What is meant with standard psychometric methods? Results in abstract; values are
missing necessary to interpret the findings. For example high reliability and internal consistency?

Introduction

2. “None of them has been validated in population settings.” To my best knowledge the instruments mentioned are validated, so it remains unclear what the authors state here.

3. The authors state that the paper has two parts. Preferably the intro would end with two clear research questions.

Methods.

4. I would strongly advise the authors to rewrite the method section. The methods start by an extensive explanation of the mapping of the questionnaire. The section is difficult to read. References to for example Survey 3 are unclear.

5. The mapping itself or/and the meta analysis may be material for a separate publication.

6. It would improve the method section to start with sample and design.

Results.

7. There is a lot of emphasis on the psychometrics; however this was not a research question.

8. Presentation of the findings can be improved by using clear subheading that relate to research questions.

9. Tables are too comprehensive and do not provide a clear insight.

Discussion.

10. The discussion section in general could be more structured with regard to your aim. Please revise this section. It is quite long and on the other hand it does not highlight most important findings.

The manuscript needs proofreading by a native speaker.
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