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Reviewer's report:

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to read this piece of work. We believe it is a relevant, well written and scientifically sound paper. Unfortunately, the fact that none of the pages indicated by the authors matched the actual pages (where the changes took place) made it extremely difficult and cumbersome to review.

We went over each comment by the previous two reviewers. We believe that all comments had very strong reasons to be made. At the same time, we believe that the authors have been able to answer accordingly and satisfactorily most concerns, which primarily were due to unclear writing on the objectives of the study. We think these issues are solved.

There are two points brought by the reviewers that could still be easily fixed:

First, the institution providing the ethical clearance should be clearly mentioned in the text, as reviewer 1 mentioned.

Second, as reviewer 2 points out. The carer terminology should be clear and consistent. In the text, we prefer the use of the well-established terms "unpaid carer vs paid carer" or "informal carer vs formal carer). Specifying a family/friend relationship restricts unnecessarily a well-known concept that already includes partners, family members, friends or neighbours. We believe the title should also make a clear difference between unpaid carers and paid carers.

It reads:
Exploring the views of being a proxy from the perspective of carers and paid care workers: developing a proxy version of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT).

We recommend:
Exploring the views of being a proxy from the perspective of unpaid carers and paid carers: developing a proxy version of the Adult Social Care Outcomes Toolkit (ASCOT)

As it is now (revision 1), we believe it is a worthy piece of evidence and that the text is relevant, accurate and publishable material on BMC HSR.
We do not have any new comment directed to the authors. We trust you can make any necessary adjustment. Best regards,

Felipe Sandoval,

Nanako Tamiya.
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