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Reviewer's report:

While I agree with the drift of your paper, I feel you should elaborate on some points and clarify some others.

On p 3 you state in line 21 that a multi-domain intervention can be effective, but in the next sentence you state there are no effective treatments. Please explain.

You state on p 10 that a proxy appointment is the preferred route. In the following sentences you claim that 'discordant preferences are likely to be corrected': could you elaborate on how this would happen? Do you really believe prior communication will correct? Is there any empirical evidence for this claim? I think you should underbuilt your argument better. Why is proxy consent superior to a first hand directive?

On p 11 line 8: you say an advance research directive can only work in the presence of a caregiver? I do not understand your reasoning here. Moreover earlier you said you preferred proxy consent, and here you say it is not necessary?

On p 13 you state euthanasia practices are problematic per se, but in the last sentence of that paragraph you state that it would be discriminatory to deny this choice to dementia patients. I get confused: what is your position?

All in all I am sympathetic to your paper. I also think your reasoning, your argumentation build-up could be stronger. You actually cover many subjects (the identity problem, critical vs experiential interests, proxy or advance directive, research, care and end-of life options) in this relatively short paper, and that leads to not all of these subjects being explored as thoroughly as they deserve.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal