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Reviewer's report:

RE: Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and Their Significant Others
Great article on the use videophone technology for use in adults with early stage dementia! Overall, I found the article easy to read and accessible as approached a very practical solution to communication. I do a few suggestions.

Dear David Vance,

Thank you for very useful comments on our manuscript “Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and their Significant Others”. Please see our answers inserted after your comments.

1. Please do not use SO as significant others; it is cumbersome and slows down the reader.
Answer: The abbreviation SO was deleted. Significant other was used.

2. Do not end a sentence with a preposition (i.e., with). This occurs throughout the paper (e.g., p. 3).
Answer: The language was reviewed once more by a proofreader.

3. Please introduce commas into the paper where a natural pause would
normally occur. As such, the limited use of commas makes for some very long sentences.

Answer: The language was reviewed once more by a proofreader.

4. On page 5, it is not certain what KTH stands for.

Answer: It is the short Swedish name for the Royal Institute of Technology. We have deleted KTH in order to make it clear.

5. On page 5, a colon should go after “criteria were:” and then semi-colons should separate the phrases.

Answer: We have made these corrections according to your suggestions.

6. On page 7, I’m not certain what “journal number 2-010/1674…..” means.

Answer: It is the study’s case number at the Regional Ethical Review Board in Stockholm.

7. Please do not use the acronym ET for everyday technology. Such acronyms are a major distraction.

Answer: The acronym ET was deleted and replaced with everyday technology.

8. Are the names “Ingrid”, “Arne” etc the actual names? I need reassurances that they are not.

Answer: We have stated that the names are fictitious in the ethics section.

9. On page 10, please remove the number system or else say, First, Second, Third, and so forth. Otherwise, this is very distracting.

Answer: We have removed the number system according to your suggestions.

10. On page 10, please reword the sentence “However, if it was obvious…..” This is a very awkward sentence and hard to understand.

Answer: We have reworded this sentence.

11. Table 1 was helpful but we don’t really know if these folks really had mild or moderate dementia or what type of dementia they had. Can more information be provided? Otherwise, it is not clear whether they have just normal age-related mild cognitive impairment or whether they have a clinical diagnosis of dementia. Was there any type of cognitive test of global functioning mentioned? If not, then this needs to be mentioned in the limitations of the study. The same came be said if the information on type of dementia is not known.

Answer: The participants with dementia had received a clinical diagnosis of dementia before inclusion. We did not use cognitive testing as our aim was not to investigate cognitive function in relation to the usability of the mock-up. We used
META in order to get information about the participants’ skills using their own telephone, cell phone and computer. This added information about their overall ability to use information and communication technology. At present, we have not discussed the diagnostic issue as a limitation because there is, to our knowledge, no studies suggesting that different subtypes of dementia would add important information to this study.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Title: Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and their Significant Others

Version: 2 Date: 24 January 2014

Reviewer: Michele Talley

Dear Michele Talley,

Thank you for very useful comments on our manuscript “Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and their Significant Others”. Please see our answers inserted after your comments.

Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct): Please see the revisions noted on the pdf copy of the returned manuscript that was uploaded for attached.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) The authors should be required to remove the names of the participants of this qualitative study. The authors’ state that they will keep the participants confidential but they should ensure anonymity as well as use a coding system for the participants.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, the authors formulated 2 questions and they were clearly written.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes, the methods are well-described. The authors should be required to remove the names of the participants of this qualitative study. The authors state that they will keep the participants confidential but they should ensure anonymity as well as use a coding system for the participants.
Answer: The participants’ names are fictitious. This was clarified in the ethics section.

3. Are the data sound?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? No. The authors should be required to remove the names of the participants of this qualitative study. The authors state that they will keep the participants confidential but they should ensure anonymity as well as use a coding system for the participants.
Answer: The participants’ names are fictitious. This was clarified in the ethics section.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, they mention that the first three phases were reported in 2 earlier articles.

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

9. Is the writing acceptable? Several typos and grammar errors are noted.
Answer: The language was reviewed once again by a proofreader.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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.

Declaration of competing interests:
1. No
2. No
3. No
4. No
5. No
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer’s report
Title: Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and their Significant Others
Dear Shameka Cody-Humphrey,

Thank you for very useful comments on our manuscript “Exploring the Usability of a Videophone Mock-up for People with Dementia and their Significant Others”. Please see our answers inserted after your comments.

Reviewer’s report:
Communication barriers in people with dementia are important issues that warrant further research. Your videophone intervention can potentially improve quality of life in people with dementia.

Major Compulsatory Revisions: none

Minor Compulsory Revisions

1). Avoid use of abbreviations (e.g., “SO”) that are not commonly used. The abbreviations disrupted the flow of the paper and made it difficult for me to focus on the content.
Answer: The abbreviation SO was deleted. Significant other has been used instead.

2). Many of your ideas clashed due to lack of punctuation. Proper usage of commas in a series can help separate the ideas. See page 3, first paragraph.
“This led to detailed information of cognitive, physical, and psychosocial challenges that…..”
Answer: The language has been reviewed once again by a proofreader.

3). Punctuation is needed after transitions, and to separate independent clauses. See page 4 in the first section that describes the phases of the Inclusive Design.
Answer: The language has been reviewed once again by a proofreader.

4). Use transitions between paragraphs and ideas to guide readers through the paper.
Answer: The language has been reviewed once again by a proofreader.

5). There were times when you went back and forth using “persons,” “person with dementia,” “dementia participants,” and “participants” to refer to your sample.
See page 8. Consider using one of these to help reduce confusion for the reader.
Answer: We have used persons with dementia when referring to persons with dementia as a group with this diagnose and participants with dementia when we refer to the sample.
6). Consider revising phrases such as “interviews were conversational,” memory investigation unit,” and “abstract actions” to clarify meaning. See pages 3, 5 & 8.
Answer: We have revised the phrases. The sentence with “abstract actions” was deleted.

7). Insert hyphens where needed (e.g., easy-to-use, telephone-related)
Answer: Hyphens were inserted.

8). On page 4, “intuitive” may not be the right word to describe the products. Use simple phrases to help lay readers understand the manuscript.
Answer: Intuitive was deleted.

9). There is good content throughout the paper; however, most of the information can be condensed. The content is too wordy and use of punctuation to combine sentences will help fix it.
Answer: The manuscript was once again reviewed by a proofreader.

10). The conclusion needs to be more sound and recap the main points presented throughout the paper. The last sentence made this section seem incomplete.
Answer: We have revised the conclusion paragraph.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests