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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.

1. Please do not use SO as significant others; it is cumbersome and slows down the reader.
2. Do not end a sentence with a preposition (i.e., with). This occurs throughout the paper (e.g., p. 3).
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.
4. On page 5, it is not certain what KTH stands for.
5. On page 5, a colon should go after “criteria were:” and then semi-colons should separate the phrases.
6. On page 7, I’m not certain what “journal number 2-010/1674…..” means.
7. Please do not use the acronym ET for everyday technology. Such acronyms are a major distraction.
8. Are the names “Ingrid”, “Arne” etc the actual names. I need reassurances that they are not.
9. On page 10, please remove the number system or else say, First, Second, Third, and so forth. Otherwise, this is very distracting.
10. On page 10, please reword the sentence “However, if it was obvious….” This is a very awkward sentence and hard to understand.
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.
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