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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes, it is posed in the Background (The current paper describes……)

Background contains some unnecessary information about the instrument and different systems. It can make the reader lose interest to continue reading. May be you could drop line 26-29; “It was developed by…….” Also you can consider dropping line 32-35 “In the province of Ontario…..” You may drop line 37 “i.e. expected length of service…”

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes, but some unnecessary parts also here; line 28-35 “The Change in Health, End-stage disease and Signs and Symptoms…..” and “The pain Scale assesses….” These scales are not used in the case mix or in table 1.

Line 62 “Informal hours were capped at 168 hours/week” – What does it mean?
One week is 168 hours. Was this amount of informal hours calculated for all of the 182 participants? However 26.4% lived alone.

3. Are the data sound?
Depression Rating Scale (DRS) is included in the case mix model. Have you forgotten to put in the data in table one? Why do you use the ADL hierarchy scale and IADL difficulty scales in table when the case mix model does not? How many used adapted or manually coded language, had communication difficulties, and transportation capacity?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, see above. In Results, line 20, the correct is; “In the replication sample, node 9…”
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Possible you could have added that misunderstandings might have occurred because of communication difficulties and cognitive impairments. And also you could have reflected on the possibility of experience of tiredness from time consuming assessments. This could have had an impact on results.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building both published and unpublished?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
But since English is not my native language, I may have overlooked possible spelling errors. Please control the reference list. There are a few incorrect space after some of the : .

10. Divide your comments into a category:
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

11. Asks your advice on publication.
I recommend that the manuscript be published

12. Reviewers are asked to note whether they think duplication or plagiarism has occurred.
NO – I do not think duplication or plagiarism has occurred

13. Reviewers should also let the journal know if they believe that research has been falsified or manipulated, or if there are issues with the authorship or contributions towards the manuscript, such as the unacknowledged involvement of a medical writer.
No – I do not think that research has been falsified or manipulated, or issues with the authorship or contributions towards the manuscript, such as the unacknowledged involvement of a medical writer.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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