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Reviewer's report:

- Change the title of page 2 to Plain Language Summary. The whole manuscript is in English, so it is redundant to say Plain English Summary. This also follows the wording in other journals and manuscripts.

- There should be some clear definitions around the term participant. In reading this manuscript, it reads as though you could be recruiting family caregivers as participants (subjects) in the research to validate the technology or as participants (collaborators) in the research to help develop the technology. Their role is not clearly defined although your methods are.

- It would be very helpful if you included examples of the criteria you were using for your recruitment ie. what skillsets you valued, previous experience working with a research team, understanding of the condition, what meaningful engagement meant to you for this study etc.

- It would also be helpful to know what information was on the recruitment posters you put up in geriatric clinics, whether you considered recruiting in support groups as well. Was their research training offered to the family caregivers who did engage? Mentorship?

- This appears to be a 'one off' opportunity for family caregivers, did you or the organizations consider recruiting family caregivers to participate in a more meaningful way where other opportunities to engage might present themselves? The organizations may be more willing to help develop the patient and caregiver engagement piece if there was more in it for them long term.

- Without seeing how the actual recruitment was done ie. information provided, training offered it's difficult to say whether this manuscript would benefit another group who may consider patient or caregiver engagement in another study.
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