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Reviewer's report:

The question is adequately defined
The use of an instrument to measure need in different populations is an appropriate methodology to address the question. However the consenting process for involvement in this research needs better description. Were people given any time to consider their involvement or was an instant decision required? The subsequent data collection methods are also glossed over. How did people with dementia complete the instrument – self completion or did advocates get involved? Did the researcher advise the professionals collecting the data (who were also asked to complete the instrument themselves). How was objectivity ensured?

The socio demographic profile of participants could have been presented more clearly in a table format. No details are provided of the professional participants. Why there were 152 professional responses and 125 from users and 125 from carers. The numbers of people with dementia who participated is stated as being 152 elsewhere. I thought that the question being posed would require a comparison of responses from the same cohorts. Presumably the 108 comparisons between users and carers were based on dyads? There is some mention of this in the limitations but there is no clear explanation of the numbers available for analysis.

The discussion is largely reliant on a comparison with work conducted in the Netherlands. There are other studies of needs in dementia, and particularly qualitative studies which may have also been brought into the discussion. There is nothing contentious in the discussion or conclusions. The paper may be of interest to the generalist rather than specialist in dementia care

The work is appropriately acknowledged.

Discretionary revisions

A more extensive literature review would provide the material for a fuller discussion of the findings

Minor essential revisions

The paper requires minor editing to improve the use of English in places. The authors should also avoid use of the acronym PWD and term patient to describe the person with dementia.

Major compulsory revisions
The authors need to provide a fuller account of the methodology for the reader to have confidence in the findings. This must include a full description of the consenting process for involvement, how people with more advanced dementia were enabled to complete the instrument, how carers were recruited and their views obtained and when professionals completed the instrument.

The questionnaires available for analysis by category of respondent must be clearly presented in tabulated format, including reasons for data not then being used in the analysis.

The paper requires minor editing to improve the use of English in places. The authors should also avoid use of the acronym PWD and term patient to describe the person with dementia.

**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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