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Reviewer's report:

This is an informative, clearly-written paper. I have a few relatively minor suggestions for changes that future readers might find helpful.

Introduction:
- p.3, lines 16-18: I'm not quite sure the point of this sentence? Is "time they are able to stay at home" the interest there, and then you are saying there are just 3 studies that have considered that as an outcome? Given the focus on independent living I suspect this may be the case, but it is awkward wording.

Results:
- I don't know if journal format will allow, but I would number the text headings as they are in the table (so 1.1 Adapting the environment, 1.2 Balancing autonomy and minimizing harm, etc.). It was a bit hard to keep the organization/themes in my head reading through the results.
- might be nice to also have one final table that highlights notable differences between the stakeholder groups on each of the themes or sub-themes. Again, a bit hard to keep track of through the text.

Discussion:
- p.22, lines 11-13—from ref, these appear to be concepts specific to older adults but not dementia? Would just be explicit here who these concepts were previously applied to—described based on what type of a population?
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