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Reviewer's report:

Two major concerns are left: the quality of written English and the value of the study for the readers of the journal. With respect to the first concern, I would suggest to consult a native English speaking person. The second major concern is fundamental. What is the value for the international community of readers to be informed about the implementation evaluation of the Dutch 'national heat plan' of 27 long-term care institutions for older people in Amsterdam? Shows this study any evidence for a world-wide or even a national recommendation to further develop and implement national heat plans and local heat protocols?

Minor concerns with respect to “Replies to reviewer 1”

Reply 2
The additional information is adequate, but the second sentence is still suggesting evidence by “.... will become an increasingly important problem as global warming will increase ..........”.

Reply 3
Reference 2 is providing information which is relevant for the readers, but not accessible due to the language barrier. I would suggest to provide a condensed summary of the report.

Reply 8
I presume that the authors changed “survey” into “questionnaire” systematically, since the present text shows the opposite problem: several times the term “questionnaire” is used, whereas “survey” is meant.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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.
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