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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript presents a systematic review of the literature on telephone and computer-delivered interventions. My comments are:

- It is not immediately clear what this manuscript substantially adds to the extensive number of systematic reviews of dementia caregiver interventions that currently exist. Also, in the discussion I do not read renewed conclusions. I believe that this manuscript can be of more value if data is synthesized differently or if a theoretical framework is added. Furthermore, it surprises me the authors stated that "there is limited synthesis of evidence", while there is even a meta-systematic review written due to the many reviews synthesizing interventions for this group.

- In the introduction it is stated that "the overall volume and type of research most be established to target where research may best serve improvements in practice and policy". In the results of the manuscript, numbers and types are given of the studies found. However, more profound results are only given of the intervention studies that met the EPOC design criteria. This does not seem to be in line with what is stated in the introduction. Also, in the discussion no implications for practice and policy are given.

- The focus of the manuscript is not entirely clear to me. As described in the title, topic of this manuscript is "technology". In the abstract it is described as "telephone and computer-delivered interventions". In the methods it is specified which interventions were included. However, I believe that this manuscript would benefit from defining 'technology' (as interpreted in this manuscript).

- It would be very valuable to know who delivered the interventions (the telephone support or mail contact). Maybe the authors can add this to table 2.
- In additional file 2 outcomes of the underlying studies are presented. This is nice overview, however there are some things that should be clarified. First, 33 studies are presented, while 34 studies were described in results section. Second, it is not clear what is meant by +, ND, MD, and - , and no effects are described. Third, it is not specified what is meant by 'costs'. Fourth, in the left upper box only 'telephone' is written. I think also computer-delivered interventions are presented? A clear distinction should be made between the different interventions.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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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