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Reviewer’s Report: Decision-making Factors Affecting Different Family Members Regarding the Placement of Relatives in Long-Term Care Facilities

General Comments
A well-written and interesting manuscript which constructively utilises a data set. The analyses are well-reported and the text and tables are generally clear.

The study is of considerable interest to researchers interested in older people and in residential care decisions, because it contributes to a very small body of quantitative research. As the authors indicate, most published research in this area has been qualitative.

The study suggests differing patterns of decision-making by different categories of relative within the same Confucian society, and highlights some ways in which the decision-making process can be facilitated.

I was a little surprised that the variables associated with cost did not appear influential in decision-making. I appreciate that relatives may be reluctant to mention cost among their primary criteria. Nevertheless I would have predicted that V10-V14, and especially V14 (whether or not the cost was met by the government) would have been associated with other variables in the sets utilised.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes

3. Are the data sound?
Yes. Currently it’s a little unclear to me how representative the sample is: it seems that on average, about 2 people responded from each facility? Or perhaps there were larger numbers from some facilities than others? Some more information on recruitment & sampling could assist the reader.

With regard to data analysis and reporting, please note that I am not in a position to comment on the selection of canonical correlations (using OVERALS to examine relationships between three data sets) in this context.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes in general. I wasn’t sure why some variables appeared more than once in Figure 1, could this Figure be explained a little more?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

No limitations were stated. Representativeness may be one. Another possible (and perhaps unavoidable) limitation is the lack of information on why a particular relative made the decision in each case (e.g. lack of any closer living relative; being the relative who will pay the costs; gender; birth order within the family; having relevant skills, experience or qualifications). I imagine these variables could result in different decision-making factors being relevant. Future research into this aspect could be recommended.

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

Yes: the contribution of the master’s student who provided the data is acknowledged.

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

Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The writing is generally good. It would benefit from a final edit for academic English.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The paper needs a final copyedit of its scientific English

Discretionary Revisions
1. See the general comments, above. The authors could consider adding a few sentences clarifying any limitations and/or addressing them.

Level of Interest
An article of importance in its field.

Quality of Written English
Needs some language corrections before being published.

Statistical Review
Yes, but as mentioned above I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the choice of the analytical method.

Declaration of Competing Interests
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Recommendation
(1) Statistical review
(2) If the statistics are satisfactory, accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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