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Reviewer's report:

Firstly, I'd like to acknowledge the efforts that there has been a clear attempt shown to address previous comments and this has improved the manuscript - well done. Overall I am happy with the quality of the paper but consider that the following are essential items needing to be addressed before it can be accepted. My main concern relates to the handling of the missing data so I've listed that first.

#Comment 3: The inclusion of information about missing data is a big improvement. However, I have some concerns about the high % of missing data for QOL, especially given that QOL is the central focus of the paper. The authors have reported a missing proportion of 28% and 19% respectively for the self-perceived and family QOL data. This seems very high (generally an acceptable range is 5-10%). Can the authors provide a reference from the literature justifying their decision for proceeding despite this high proportion?

#Comment 1: The authors state in their response and in the paper that participants were included if they provided signed informed consent. However what I am trying to establish is how many patients were invited to participate out of all the patients receiving home-based medical care through the 7 medical facilities. Surely this was more than 184 patients, and surely not all of those invited agreed to participate (if so, that is a good result and more information should be provided about how they were invited to inform other studies). Could the authors please provide additional information in the Methods section about the invitation process, total number approached and % agreeing to give signed informed consent?

#Comment 4: I believe that the fact that demographics were collected only at baseline while the QOL was collected longitudinally is also relevant to the discussion as well as the methods. In your discussion you suggest that divorce may protect against decline in self-perceived QOL & therefore that married (note: typo, should be changed to 'marital') status might not be essential in late-life QOL. However you don't know this for sure as your participants may have remarried after baseline. This needs to be acknowledged somewhere as a limitation in your interpretation of these results.
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.

Unable to assess

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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