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Reviewer’s report:

The research questions are well defined, methods are appropriate and well described. The data and figures appear to be sound and genuine. The conclusions are adequately supported by the data. Limitations are clearly stated and issues of generalisability are considered. The title is acceptable.

However the following points need to be addressed:

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Abstract – be helpful to put percentages in brackets where numbers are given.
2. Introduction: Please clarify the sentence lines 117 and 118 “We registered Pt using the proposed instrument [1] next to a number of characteristics of people with dementia, their informal carers and the caregiving situation…” This is somewhat unclear
3. Lines 189 and 190: Descriptive statistics of all variables are presented in mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and in percentages for categorical variables. This should include numbers and percentages
4. Lines 206-208: As described elsewhere [1], 223 informal carers were included in this longitudinal study at baseline. During the two-year follow-up 25 carers dropped out because of non-response (after 208 reminders). – It is not clear what is meant by the 223 ‘included’? The text and figure 1 need to indicate how many were invited? How many responded? and how many were followed-up into the study?
5. Figure 2 – the axis are not labelled – x and y axis..is it PT on the y axis? All figures need titles and clear labelling
6. text line 220 – mean age should be accompanied by standard deviation (as shown in table 1). The same needs to be done for other variables discussed in the text.
7. Line 261…‘commonly varied?’

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. There is no mention of sample size calculations? And for subsamples. Was this conducted? If it was done in reference 1 (earlier paper), it still needs to be indicated.
2. Comment on limitations, if appropriate, in the context of sample size, whether
or not it was adequate

3. The authors need to comment on the findings within the context of the validity of the tool. (published in their early work) so the reader can see why the authors measured the domains they did.

The manuscript is acceptable subject to minor and few major revisions suggested.

Discretionary Revisions

1. It would be interesting to see whether PT reflected any specific challenges or behaviours of people with dementia that the carer had to deal with?
2. Pt may reflect extended family support – it would be interesting to see whether those with family support had different PTs.
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