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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Overall, very interesting study; however, there are methodological and organizational issues that need to be addressed. Some of the analyses were not clearly specified a priori and statistical analyses were not described clearly. Also, study methods are discussed in results and results of these methods are not described, but rather listed. Please see comments for more detailed suggestions.

Unsure why certain parts of manuscript are highlighted. Also, manuscript should be formatted according to BMC Geriatric standards (i.e. double spaced).

Introduction lines 8-24: There are some studies over 10 years old; is it possible to update some of these references? Demographics of caregivers are changing.

In the introduction, consider commenting on what is known (state of the science) about caregivers in the Czech Republic, instead of discussing Czech's healthcare history.

Methods in abstract do not seem to align with methods in paper; Methods in abstract state sample was recruited from senior care homes (seems like institutionalization or long term care facilities), but methods in paper describe "home care agencies." Please clarify.

Page 5 Lines 39-51: Not clear if your sample is formal or informal (i.e. family/friend) caregivers. Please clarify. Again, page 11 lines 13-20 confuse reader as to who these caregivers are: formal or informal?

For data collection methods, how were the survey questions constructed? Were they based on well validated scales/instruments? If not, will affect validity/reliability of study findings. Also noted open-ended questions, so was this a mixed methods study?

Page 10 Line 29: Table 2 is the types of costs, not diseases. Please correct.
Page 11 Lines 26-27 Again, you refer to incorrect table. Please review results again to ensure you refer to correct figures.

Some of the findings in the results section are redundant (One example: Page 8 lines 28-30, Page 9 Lines 22-25, and Page 10 Lines 47-51 all discuss employment status of caregivers with the same or similar numbers). Please synthesize and condense.

Also, for tables 3, 4, and 5 it is important to put the total sample size supporting these numbers (so readers can understand the denominators).
For Figure 1, Your chart key is not clear-- Who is the "Patient" referred to in the key: Caregiver or care recipient? Also, consider putting percents in Figure 1 instead of "Patient number" as you refer to percents in your results. A little confusing to reader when interpreting results.

For results section 3.3 and 3.4, please provide additional details in your methods/statistical analysis section to address the analyses that were performed. Also, please check statistical language used throughout manuscript, some errors were noted. For example, pg. 13 lines 15-16 .01 is significance (p-value), not a confidence interval.

Also, were there any previous scientific findings, theories, or hypotheses that were driving your statistical analyses? Sometimes it is a unclear why you are exploring various relationships and whether you had specified relationships a priori.

In Section 3.4 Cost Analysis (p. 13), how were publicly available data and insurance costs linked to your dataset? Were you somehow able to link these data to people who were in your sample? There are issues in terms of generalizability, as these costs may not be what your sample paid (we are just assuming your sample paid this amount). Please acknowledge that this is an assumption you are making and it is a limitation. For this section, also discuss your findings more, rather than focusing on how calculations were performed (calculations should be in methods or supplemental materials, not results). It was also not clear you would be performing these analyses from your study purpose/methods sections. Please address.

In discussion section (pg. 15-17), please try to add more discussion about how your results relate to current scientific literature. Also, you discuss findings in your conclusion that weren't necessarily reported in your results (i.e. pg. 16 lines 33-35), unless I missed it (as it did not appear to be a main/important finding in your study). Also, please acknowledge some of the limitations of your study in the discussion, not necessarily your conclusions (as you do not want readers focusing on study weaknesses as concluding thoughts).

Please ensure references are cited according to BMC Geriatrics' reference style.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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