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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
I am very pleased to read your article. From my point of view the quality of this article is outstanding. I am really impressed by your work. Beside I think that this study, is important for the international audience, in order to identify persons with the need/wish for NH in advance.

I think the whole paper is very well organized and written. The background is sound and the methodology as well as the results are clear and precise. The discussion is very well and all limitations addressed.

* In what ways does it not meet best practice?
There are some minor points to address. One thing came in my mind. You are talking in the title and background of UI and FI separately. However in the methods and results it is about UI vs. MI.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Please think about the wording.
In the title you write about UI and FI. However the article is focusing UI in contrast to MI. You did not collect/analyse data of persons with regard to FI alone!
Think about using „continence status“: age 5, line 134; Page 12, line 337; Figure 1

Page, 5 line 110: We hypothesized that: (i) UI and FI as components of needs for help and care both have an impact on the place of LTC considered as most appropriate and (ii) respondents' own characteristics, classified according to Andersen's model, change LTC preferences.
I suggest to make it more precise to rephrase it into:
We hypothesized that: (i) UI and FI as components of needs for help and care both have an impact on the place of LTC considered as most appropriate and (ii) respondents' predisposing, enabling and need factors, classified according to Andersen's model, change LTC preferences.

Page 7, line 188: Associations at p<0.05 level defined model candidates.
Page 8, line 198: The significance alpha level was fixed to 0.05.
As you mention the p-values twice, I suggest to write at the end of the section „Statistics“: The significance alpha level was fixed to 0.05.

Could you also please write in the section „Statistics“ about the Pseudo-R , what does it mean and how it can be interpretated.

I would include Table 1, before the section „Effect of incontinence displayed in the vignette“

Page 8, line 212: There was a significant difference in LTC choices depending on incontinence severity displayed in the vignette (Friedman test, p<0.001) (Figure 1). I think this is not shown in figure 1.

„Effect of incontinence displayed in the vignette"
Please order the text results into the same order as in the table, e.g.:
The SH option was selected by 26%....There was a significant difference.....Post hoc analysis.

Predisposing factors Home vs SH
Please order the text results into the same order as in the table. See comment above.

Predisposing factors NH vs SH
Please order the text results into the same order as in the table. See comment above.

Enabling Factor Home vs SH
Please order the text results into the same order as in the table. See comment above.

Page 13, line 351: The effect of incontinence, and particularly of FI,… This is again the aspect with is it MI or FI?? Because you did not ask for FI alone.
Figure 1: Form e the sample size for BADL only (N=?), BADL +UI (N=?) and BADL+MI (N=?) is missing.

Table 1: I suggest to delete, when there are dichotomos answers (yes/no) to delete the no line, because it is self-explanatory.

Table 3: As you set the p-value to 0.05, for me it would be enough, to use only this p-value, and not differentiate between *p<.05; **p .01 and ***p<.001.

**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.

Yes

**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:

Acceptable
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