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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for the opportunity to read and review this interesting manuscript concerning a very important topic. Overall the manuscript is well written, the choice of method is relevant, and the result is presented in an adequate way. I have only a few comments.

Line 135- It might be of value if more information about the recruitment of the participants were added. Why seven, did anyone decline to participate (of which profession?). Data saturation?

Line 161- What role did the other authors have in the analysis of the data?

Line 164- "The impact of an existing…" This topic could perhaps be further discussed in the discussion section. Is it a possibility that the theme "Responsibility to care" was influenced by the relationship between the participants and the interviewer? Please discuss how the result could have been affected (line 556)?

Line 238-241- This is important and should perhaps be emphasized even more in the manuscript.

Line 255- Maybe the concept of Memory cafes should be shortly explained for the" international audience"?

Line 280-283- Is this a result or part of the discussion of the results?

Line 528- Perhaps it should be mentioned that these references (29,30,31) are not specifically about people with dementia. As your results also show, (for example line 397), problems with delivered meals could be different for persons with dementia compared to others.

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.

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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