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**Reviewer’s report:**

Overall ....no major concerns. Feedback for authors:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?—The primary research question is important in the work related to caregiver research and expands upon the previously reported literature.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Methods were well delineated.

3. Are the data sound? Data analysis was very helpful to be able to report logistic regression findings which puts new light on caregiver status.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?—Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?---Discussion section well written and really cites and discusses prior work and how the findings from this study build upon the previous literature.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?—Yes

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

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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