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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewer comments
We would like to thank all the reviewers and editor for their positive feedback and helpful comments to help us improve the overall paper. We have addressed all reviewer comments and provided responses below following each comment.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Nathan Davies (on behalf of all authors)

Some editorial comments:
1. Please include a Keywords section under the Abstract, with three to ten keywords relating to your manuscript.
We have added these under the abstract

2. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

We have deleted them in text and moved to after the references.

Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

We have checked these and they are all correct.

3. The Availability of data and materials section refers to the raw data used in your study and presenting tables and figures is not sufficient to state that all data is contained within the manuscript and additional files. Please only use this statement if you have indeed provided all raw data on which your study is based. We strongly encourage all authors to share their raw data, either by providing it in a supplementary file or depositing it in a public repository and providing the details on how to access it in this section. If you do not wish to share your data, please clearly state this in this section along with a justification. Data availability statements can take one of the following forms (or a combination of more than one if required for multiple datasets):

- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are available in the [NAME] repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS]
- The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].
- The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due [REASON WHY DATA ARE NOT PUBLIC] but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.
- The data that support the findings of this study are available from [third party name] but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of [third party name].

Please note that if you do wish to share your raw data and do not have consent from all patients to publish this data it will need to be de-identified.

Please also note that if you include your raw data as a supplementary file you will need to provide, after the References, a section titled “Additional files” where you list the following information about each of your supplementary files: * File name (e.g. Additional file 1), * Title of data, * Description of data. All additional files will also need to have been cited in the main manuscript.

We have added the relevant statement.

4. Please indicate the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript in the Funding section.

We have added the relevant statement.
5. The "T" from Table 1 has been separated onto a different page, maybe due a page break, please amend this.

This has been amended.

Reviewer reports:
Meera Agar (Reviewer 2): The authors have taken the reviewers comments into consideration and I believe the response is comprehensive and has enhanced the message of the paper. For the few reviewer points which they have not chosen to revise their explanation and arguments for this are clear A minor comment - the information on line 209-215 in methods commencing with 'Participants mean age was 74 years old....' outline participant characteristics should be moved to results

We have moved this to the start of the results section lines 335-341.

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: I was not one of the original reviewers on this paper, but echo the comments of other reviewers that this study is well written, interesting, and addresses an important issue for caregivers of people with dementia. The link to the previously published earlier stages of the research are mainly clear.
The authors have addressed the majority of the reviewers comments fully and have clearly specified why they have chosen not to make changes suggested where relevant.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I have a few minor comments that would help add clarity to the manuscript.

1. Page 6 - clarify why there are 4 stages in the abstract and 3 stages discussed here.

   We have added a statement on page 6 line 153 to demonstrate the overall study had 3 phases, but this paper only discusses phase 3 which itself was split into 4 stages.

2. Page 10 - where the authors state that phase 1 & 2 data was analysed elsewhere, please include the reference(s) 3. Were there any disagreements within the discussions of content for the website?

   We have added the references to line 257.

   We have also added a statement on lines 273-275 to state any disagreements were discussed until a consensus was reached.

4. It would be useful for the authors to include some information about how the planned website will be accessed - how will caregivers learn about the existence of the website?

   This is still to be determined and we envisage this to form a future implementation study were we focus on the implementation of the website in practice. We have added this to page 22 line 562-564 where we discuss implementation.