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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for Authors for addressing this important issues about consensus on care and treatment in long term care between relatives and formal carers.

The Abstract is well structured and informative even if in the paragraph on methods authors don't report any details about tools used in the assessment of the variables considered which is recomended.

Background: the litterature anlysed is coherent with the aim of the study. I suggest authors to make a clarification about the concept of "consensus on care and treatment" in order to clarify if they are referring to something different from shared decision or informed consent as well as care plan which can involve relatives of elderly and in particular people with dementia.

Methods: Selecting settings the authors report that in Italy they use a "previously constructed cluster of LTCFs ….." without mentionning any reference about. can authors report a reference about or other information. It is not not clear the method used for data collection. Did researcher sent the questionnaire by regular mail or they use another way to get responses? In the measurement paragraph the authors use both open questions and questionnaires in six different countries. For some questionnaire (EQ-5D for ex.) there is already a validated version in the different Language. How did authors manage to validate the translated version of the questionnaires or the questions. Furthermore which kind of instructions are given to both relatives and care staff about the study and the questionnaire in order to allow them to take part. Did authors just sent out the questionnaires or also a letter to explain and collect consensus on participation??For Within the relatives characteristics (p 7, line 147) the authors use the term Palliative care while in other parts they use end of life care. are the terms synonymous, did the participants receive a definition about palliative care?? The response rate is really excellent and reinforce the need of more information about recruitment (see before). In anlysis the authors decide to analyze only one of the 3 responses regarding the care staff questions (the one regarding consensus among all those involved) while the results of the other two options are not considered (among staff themselves and among family themselves). can authors give some clarification about the decision??

Results: the results are described with enough details and well reported. I have some concern about table 2 which report a large amount of results and can be difficult to follow. My suggestion is to split the table in 2 parts.
Discussion: In the first part of the discussion the authors report again about results which is repetitive. I would suggest to shorten this part since results are already described. Since the research questions are 2: one about rate of consensus and one about influencing factors the paragraph related to countries differences can be moved to the end or differences can be included discussing results of the 2 research question. The differences between countries can influence the 2 question research. Differences between countries can be on cultural level (role of physician and nurses toward relatives or in process of gathering consensus which can cover a wide range of action from communicating the treatment to discussing the care and treatment.

Strength and Limit: the authors report well about strengths and limits of the study are described
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