Reviewer's report

Title: Informal Carers' Perspectives on the Delivery of Acute Hospital Care for Patients with Dementia: A Systematic Review

Version: 0 Date: 11 Jul 2017

Reviewer: Sarah Goldberg

Reviewer's report:

This is a very useful paper reporting a systematic search and review of research and grey literature on the informal carers perspectives of acute hospital car to inform best practice service delivery.

In the background, could you give some figures on the prevalence of patients with dementia in the acute hospital. See the work of Liz Sampson, which estimates 40% of older patients have dementia in the acute hospital. Also you could reference Who Cares Wins (RCPsych, 2005).

Could you also include a comment on who these informal carers are ie a wide range of relations including spouses, sons/daughters, brothers/sisters, god children, etc.

Was your systematic review protocol registered on PROSPERO, if not could this be mentioned as a weakness.

Could you mention in the section on narrative thematic synthesis p5-6 who did the coding, and what their expertise is.

Page 16 line 376 to 380. Could you rephrase this sentence, it is very long and difficult to follow.

Implications of research findings - the carers are likely to be consultees in the care of a patient with dementia who lack capacity, and therefore will have input to the decision making even when there isn't power of attorney. Can you make this clear (line 390-393). Could you also
discuss the Carers Act in this section and the responsibilities the healthcare professionals have to identify carer needs?

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

Yes

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

Yes

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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