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General

Along with the first reviewer, I have struggled with the sample including both informal and formal caregivers. I remain unconvinced from the data presented that other than the theme of Moral, Religious and Spiritual motives, that the themes relate equally to both groups.

Personally, I think it would make for a stronger paper to first report the informal caregiver findings in one paper, and then to submit a second paper whereby the formal caregiver findings can be presented, in which the study findings compared to the informal caregiver can be made.

My comments are made on the assumption of the splitting of the findings into two separate papers

Abstract

General - the term people living with Alzheimer's Disease or other Dementia, and the acronym ADOD is not commonly used, and I would suggest sticking to the commonly used People with Dementia (PWD) as one of the first reviewers suggested

Background

Page 5 Ln 9 - I would use the umbrella term Dementia

Page 5 Ln - 21 - care-giving is a worldwide phenomenon - not limited to the US

P5 Ln 26 - responsibility of caregiving by formal caregivers is taken up - not assumed
Methods

Page 6 Ln 26-29 - The analysis in this study does not appear to use grounded theory techniques (and in fact the data analysis techniques do not fit with grounded theory) furthermore I would disagree with the definition of grounded theory given in the text - I would suggest removal of reference to grounded theory

Page 6 Ln 46 - should be Female and male - not plural

Page 7 Ln 16/17 - an example of the topic areas would be helpful

Findings

As above - need to report the findings from each group in separate publications, but general points as below:

Page 9 - Ln 20 - would not use the term 'dear one' - how do we know it is the dear one? The person might be hated - needs to be a more neutral/descriptive term

Page 9 - Ln 33 - should be older people, rather than for older adult

Page 9 Ln 41 - why is trained or not trainer formal care giver status mentioned for every quote - not sure if you found a difference ? If so, would be relevant to discuss further in a separate formal caregiver paper

Page 11 - First paragraph - does social networks apply to informal caregivers - if so, this is not shown in the text

Page 11 - Paragraph three - the quote from the care giver does not illustrate the theme, unless she is saying that she harms her father-in-law in some way?

Page 12 Ln 11, again not sure if the quote illustrates the wider themes as just because that we can say that the motive was immoral because a formal care giver reported stole from the household - there might be other explanations, as this is a proxy report.

Discussion

General point - how do the four themes fit together and what is their status to each other -For example, for formal caregivers are financial motives stronger than religious motives?
P13 Paragraph four - not sure that the safeguarding recommendations, however well meaning, are justified by the data presented.

Study limitations

How generalizable are findings in other cultures? Particularly those which are secular?
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