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Reviewer's report:

I really do like this revised version of the paper. There is one point I would like to have clarified as well as some comments on word choice.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) In my understanding, persons who are invited to participate in a study but do not participate, should not be counted into the study sample. Thus, in the abstract, there should be 2697 clients of nursing homes participating (those who responded to the invitation) and not 2765, there should be 2164 clients in psychogeriatric care who responded, and not 2808, as well as 1462 clients from home-care (1613 completed the questionnaire but 151 had to be excluded), for a total of 6323 instead of 8376 (page 19). Also, I do not understand the numbers regarding sample sizes in table 1: it would be nice if one could relate these numbers to the numbers of clients invited into the study as detailed on page 13 and 14.

2) page 8: fourth sentence is hard to follow, please cut in two.

3) page 8 and 9 "organizations" and institutions": please reserve the term organization for the research organizations and stick to "institution" when referring to care institutions.

4) page 12, second paragraph, 3rd question: I would suggest "Item candidates for modification or exclusion were selected according to the following criteria..."

5) page 13, Interviews with residents, 1st sentence: 29% were not eligible (instead of "was")

6) page 17, Sampling: I do not like the term "bottlenecks" when you refer to different types of problems in the sampling process. Maybe "difficulties"?

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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