**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Exploring Supported Conversation with Familial Caregivers of Persons with Dementia: A Pilot Study

**Version:** 0  **Date:** 01 Oct 2018

**Reviewer:** Laura Hughes

**Reviewer's report:**

**Summary:**

This is a well-written paper about an interesting and important topic. The study assessed the use of an adapted version of supported conversation with adults with dementia and their carers. As the authors point out this is an important area of study, the breakdown of communication can have severe detrimental effects on relationships between carers and people with dementia and increase carer burden.

**Comments**

The authors provide detailed background of the topic that provides a good rational for the study. They also provide detailed descriptions of the measures used and link each to the relevant research question to guide the reader. For the benefit of the reader and to make the manuscript clearer perhaps a visual guide for the TANDEM and FOCUSED programmes could be included. There is a lot of written information about the different aspects that were used for participant training. A figure or diagram would help to clearly understand how the different programmes were used.

Results are succinct and clearly laid out. However, I would like to see more detailed results or acknowledgment of the changes to unproductive behaviours. This would add more to the results section. Table 3 almost seems unnecessary without further explanation of the results contained within it. This would provide also provide an opportunity to discuss it further in the discussion section.

The discussion section would benefit from more in depth discussion of the findings in relation to the wider literature. For example, lines 400-407 is a recap of the results with no fuller discussion of the findings.

The limitations of the study are clearly presented and discussed, as are the future research ideas and suggestions.
Typographical errors

Page 7: line 137. Does is underlined.

Page 13: line 266-267. Fix sentence that reads, "there is a considerable focus of the programme is education on dementia and its effects"

Page 16: line 340. MSC statistic stated twice, I think one should be MPC
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