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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Line 103-105: Need a reference for this definition
Line 109-110: need page number for this quote
Line 113-115: Not clear, please revise for clarity

Line 170; not clear about countries here. Which 8 countries? How are these countries relevant to this research/the authors of this manuscript? Please explain

Line 172: add "in this study" after "interview"

Line 177: "was" should be "were"

Line 184: probed should be probe

Line 186 and on: Would be helpful to include some of the questions asked in the interviews. Line 190 - works should be work.

Line 199 - 212: clarify who the members of the RTPC consortium are and their significance to your study. Include specific examples from your study to illustrate your analysis process.

Line 227: delete the apostrophe after participants

Line 233: delete ’s after people

Line 394: parts should be part

Line 481: proposes should be propose

Lines 519-520: revise to say "although next of kin could compensate..."

Line 529: Start a new paragraph at Surprisingly

Lines 539 to 561: Discuss further the fact that kin are not always available (they may live far away or be busy with their own lives) or even exist (many seniors do not have children) and how this may affect care and collaboration. Also, discuss the fairness/ unfairness of the expectation by the state that kin will provide care - this seems to absolve the state of providing needed care at the expense of kin,
who are usually women ie. unpaid caregiving by women. Also women tend to be
the caregivers of not only their family members, but those of their spouse. More
discussion is needed here about who kin are, if they exist/implications for those
without family, where they exist/live (rural vs urban caregiving, locations of kin,
etc.), and expectations of them and of the state.

Also, more discussion is needed about how support can be provided to kin as
well as to care providers ie discuss implications, and provide some suggestions.

Lines 577-579: What are other limitations of focus groups? Perhaps participants
would not feel free to discuss sensitive and private experiences and perceptions
in a focus group, especially as other focus group participants are people they
know and work with. This could limit the nature and amount of data obtained in
the study.

Line 590: add in this study after presentation of the findings, delete will, enhance
should be enhances.

More discussion and suggestion of solutions (for care providers, kin, the state) is
needed in the Discussion section to increase the meaningfulness and utility of
your study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being
published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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