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Comments for Authors

This manuscript entitled "My husband is not ill; he has memory loss - Caregivers' perspectives on health care services for persons with dementia" examined informal caregivers' perspectives and perceived needs related to health care services/activities for older adults with dementia. Using a qualitative method, the authors found that the current health care services do not meet the needs of either the persons with dementia or their caregivers. The topic itself is very interesting and worth investigation, but there is still room for improvement before it can reach the publication standard of BMC Geriatrics. The authors may want to make revisions with reference to the following comments and suggestions:

1. In the "Background" section, the authors may want to elaborate more on "caregiver burden" in paragraph 2.

Moreover, in paragraph 3, rather than simply claim that "A multinational review of interventions to reduce dementia-caregiver burden found that most of these interventions have been unsuccessful", the authors should explain what the main types of interventions were included for review, and to what extent and based on what standard, they were seen as unsuccessful.

Similarly, it is unclear what "multicomponent intervention design" refers to.

2. In the "Methods" section, although the authors tried to provide reasons why focus group not individual in-depth interviews were used for data collection, the rationale remains unclear.

Were all the participants primary caregivers for their family member with dementia? Based on what criteria, the participants were formed into two focus groups? How long was each focus group interview?

If both spousal and children caregivers were included, would the sample size (n= 8) be too small to make meaningful conclusions?
Factors such as how long the participants have been taking care of the dementia person, the severity level of dementia should also be taken into consideration.

3. The results section is generally clear, but the findings seem to be simple and superficial. Whether there are any different experiences/perspectives between working caregivers and retired ones, between male and female caregivers, between experienced and inexperienced caregivers have not been analysed and discussed.

4. If more detailed comparisons had been made between different types of informal caregivers, and taking into consideration the severity level of dementia, the authors could then provide meaningful policy and service suggestions to design and implement tailored programs for informal caregivers and patients with dementia.

**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.

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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