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Reviewer’s report:

The present study attempted to clarify the experiences of end of life amongst family caregivers of older adults with advanced dementia, including bereaved caregivers, using both of quantitative and qualitative data collection. This is relevant on the gerontology or geriatrics expertise. Unfortunately, I am not interested in it, because the research question and the study design are quite confused and the process of the data collection is not logical.

1. Did all family caregivers who participated in the study experience the death of older adults with advanced dementia? I assume that authors included caregivers who unexperienced and experienced the death of older adults, seeing figure 1. Authors should not combine those data, because caregiving experience is theoretically heterogeneous between caregivers and bereaved those.

2. Why did they utilize both of qualitative and quantitative data collection? How many participants replied the follow-up survey in 12 caregivers participated in qualitative interviews? I think that those qualitative data cannot apply to the quantitative data. I suggest that authors could use only qualitative data.

3. Numbers or selection criteria of participants in each time point is different, regarding Table 2. It does not make a sense.

4. How did authors collect quantitative data? Structured interview? Self-administrated survey?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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