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Reviewer's report:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore):

The naming of the category ‘impact of the environment’ does not quite adhere with the content. The authors could consider another name; e.g. ‘resources’ or ‘health care policy’.

The manuscript is quite lengthy, it would be more readable if the authors chose to shorten their telling. Also, the listing of collaboration on different levels seems redundant as it is not linked to the other findings.

Did the authors consider also organising focusgroups with mixed HCP and informal carers? If yes, why did they decide not to? If no, could this have enriched the data?

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached):

In the abstract, the analysis of the data should be described.

Although the background of the research is generally well described, I do miss a clear statement of the goal or research question in this section.

The authors give a comprehensible description of the methods. For completeness, the authors should described whether a member check was conducted and whether data saturation was achieved.

Several findings seem to imply that the current government policy on dementia care in Germany, as well as in other European countries, does not attune with the care needs of the people involved. For instance, while prevention and early-detection are beneficial for both the dementia patient and the informal care giver, no funding for this is provided. Likewise, although one of the main problems in taking care for people with dementia is the unexpected events and the unpredictability of care situations, the HCP is expected to hold a schedule and to plan for predefined care moments. I think the data from the focus groups endorse this discrepancy and I would suggest the authors emphasise this more clearly in the discussion.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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