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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (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 sufficient 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?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This paper has been reviewed twice and the extensive reviewers' comments have all been addressed by the authors in relation to the partial QPP tool used and statistics. These have been tracked in the revisions.

The use and relevance of using a small sample has been justified.

Thank you for this information which is important as follows - "The two researchers (BB, RH) who conducted the interviews and filled in the questionnaire were not employed in the municipality." Page 19.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I, however, have an issue in relation to the language used and so "patient-relative dyads". I had to check the word "dyad" which has different potential meanings and it refers to a pair. What if there is more than one relative? Dyad needs to be carefully defined for this paper please. The other word is "security" and I wonder if this is the best word. Security and home care I would have associated with intruders or burglars when this is not what is meant here. This needs to be stated or an alternative words used. It was the first thing I thought when I saw the title again it is just a matter of language and potential interpretations of language. Is security the exact wording used in the QPP questionnaire or has it been modified?

Similarly, "municipalities" which means different things in different countries and a single sentence definition would be helpful for the reader.

To help the reader, maybe help on page 14 to putting these abbreviations in full as well - MT, PT, ID) and so remind the reader.

In the abstract and conclusion some of the actual key findings via statistics / p values may be useful for "Data which were analysed by descriptive statistics, Chi-squared test, T-test and Wilcoxon's signed rank test."

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

As detailed earlier.

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.

No

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

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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