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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written, useful article that contributes to the literature on support for Alzheimer disease (AD) medication in a tax-funded national health services system. The study is rigorous and will be important to health policy makers in Canada and other industrialized nations. While I do have a number of 'major' comments, the authors can be trusted to take them into account -- thus my classification of the article as requiring only "minor essential revision".

Major comments

1. Methods

The authors should explain why they did not conduct a contingent valuation study to elicit the amount of tax support individuals would be willing to pay for AD medication. In their review and discussion of the literature, the authors cover a number such contingent valuation studies. A contingent valuation would have provided richer information and might have been less prone to biases, such as Yeah-saying bias, because the respondents would have needed to carefully weigh their spending on AD medication provision against other consumption opportunities.

In addition, a 'yes' to a tax support of unmeasured size is difficult to interpret, since different respondents may have imagined very different size contributions (and these sizes may systematically vary with observed variables, such as income).

2. Methods and results

Please explain the choice of the outcome variable in the regression analysis, "participant for tax increase under at least one scenario". I would suggest that the authors present the results of regressions of their independent variables against support for each of the scenarios, separately.

3. Methods: Page 7, para 3

Please report and analyze the contact and consent rates, using the ASDE Survey Sample for this study. Can sample selection have substantially biased results?

Please also provide the proportion of Canadians who are unlikely to be reached via a telephone-based survey. Who are they (homeless, institutionalized, etc.)?
4. Results:
It would be useful if the authors added subsections on "validity checks" to their results and discussion sections. While some validity checks are reported in different places in the paper (e.g. p. 10, para 3), they should be summarized into one subsection and discussed.

In particular, we would expect that the likelihood of tax support for AD medication should increase with efficacy of the medication and decrease with adverse effects.

Are there any other such validity checks possible? In a contingent valuation of AD medication, we would expect the willingness to pay to increase with income. However, in a system with progressive taxation, tax support (as a binary variable) should not necessarily increase with increasing income -- please discuss the effect of income on tax support as shown in Table 3.

Minor comments
1. Methods:
Page 7, para 1
Please provide the main survey instrument in an appendix -- this will enable the reader to judge the quality of the responses.
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