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Reviewer's report:

The subject of this article is in the news. The situation of demented persons is very specific and the article rightly highlights a number of these specificities.

The title "Advance guidelines as a tool to respect patients' values and believes" could imply an original work. In fact, this paper is the expression of an opinion rather than an original study or a review.

The introduction (like the summary) addresses the subject in terms of progress in diagnosis, with in particular the emergence of biomarkers allowing early diagnosis of the disease. However, the development of the argument does not mention the impact of this progress on the previous situation. The author should logically analyze the consequences of "biotechnological" progress and its impact on ethical, moral and legal considerations, if any.

A reminder of the concept and application of advance directives by country would be appropriate at the beginning of the article. Similarly, the factors (in particular socio-cultural factors) influencing the adoption or not of a regulation in this field could be mentioned. Finally, the scope of these guidelines seems to be limited to care, could reflection be opened on more general aspects of quality of life?

The stated purpose of the paper is to discuss the value of advance directives in dementia. The reader's legitimate expectation would therefore be to find an analysis of the studies on the intrinsic value of advance directives and their impact in the context of dementia in relation to other pathological situations. Moreover, in accordance with the title "enticing", the reader would expect some confrontation between the "patients' values and believes" and the content of the advance directives. Could the author elaborate on what it encompasses in patients' values and believes?

Could very practical questions concerning advance directives be highlighted? when, how, where they can be drafted? who can be the depositary? how to know that they exist (especially for an "incompetent" or demented person)? what should be its content? what are the difficulties of possible formulations and interpretation? etc.
Several notions (rupture of personal identity, conflicts interests before and after disease etc.) are important to relativize in relation to the practices of the advance directives. These guidelines may be formulated on the occasion of the occurrence of a serious condition or, in general, outside of any pathological context. Could the concept of temporality and duration of validity of advance directives be underlined?

It is particularly appropriate to address different circumstances such as care, involvement in research and the end of life. Can the author comment on the differences in values in these situations, and how best to approach them in practice?

In conclusion, the title, introduction and development appear somewhat disconnected. The author could rely more on the studies already conducted, especially in The Netherlands and Germany, to present the knowledge, experiences and attitudes regarding advance directives in patients who have become mentally incompetent.
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