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### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| REVIEWER            | Du, Juan  
|                     | Capital Medical University, School of General Practice and Continuing Education |
| REVIEW RETURNED     | 23-Nov-2022 |
| GENERAL COMMENTS    | This paper aimed to give an overview of instruments to identify and measure (over)burden of caring relatives in general practice. Some limitations had been found.  
1. The title should be revised. ‘Intervention’ in the title was not mentioned in the research objectives and the concept section of the inclusion criteria.  
2. Background Section:  
(1) Add the relevance of measuring caregiver burden to early identification of caregivers.  
(2) Add the comment of existing scoping reviews on measuring caregiver burden.  
3. Methods and Analysis Section:  
(1) The authors mentioned “The protocol was developed by using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist and…….” (Line 6-7, Page 6) but the flow diagram according to the PRISMA-ScR was missed.  
(2) The initial search strategies or submitting online supplementary material to explain the preliminary search process should be added at Line 34, Page 6 “identifying relevant studies”.  
(3) The inclusion and exclusion criteria for eligible studies should be rewrite according to the objectives of the review. In addition, the content of table 1 was exactly the same as the text in the manuscript (Line 51-60, Page 6).  
4. The authors should pay attention to English writing such as Page 4, line 44 ‘e.g.’ and Page 4, line 52 ‘GP’. |

| REVIEWER            | CHEN, Yaohua  
|                     | University of Lille |
| REVIEW RETURNED     | 23-Dec-2022 |
| GENERAL COMMENTS    | Dear authors, |
Thank you for submitting this protocol paper. Carers are a group of vulnerable people, who need the attention of different professionals, especially the GPs. This scoping review should address this important issue.

I have some few comments:
1. The authors did not explain the methodology of the extraction of data from the qualitative studies
2. There could be a section of discussion and/or conclusion
3. The reason of the choice of the time frame from 2020 should be explained.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1:

The title should be revised. 'Intervention' in the title was not mentioned in the research objectives and the concept section of the inclusion criteria.

Thank you very much for the legitimate note, we have adapted the title.

Background Section:
(1) Add the relevance of measuring caregiver burden to early identification of caregivers.
(2) Add the comment of existing scoping reviews on measuring caregiver burden.

Thank you very much for the legitimate note, we have added the amendments needed (p. 3, ll. 27-29).

3. Methods and Analysis Section:
(1) The authors mentioned “The protocol was developed by using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist and……”(Line 6-7, Page 6) but the flow diagram according to the PRISMA-ScR was missed.

(1) As the review process is not finished yet, the flow diagram will be presented in the final scoping review.

(2) The initial search strategies or submitting online supplementary material to explain the preliminary search process should be added at Line 34, Page 6 “identifying relevant studies”.

(2) A search strategy was developed for pubmed, then adapted for the other databases. Please see supplement 1.

(3) The inclusion and exclusion criteria for eligible studies should be rewrite according to the objectives of the review. In addition, the content of table 1 was exactly the same as the text in the manuscript (Line 51-60, Page 6).

(3) The table is used for visual illustration and clear presentation of the criteria and now available a supplement 2.

The authors should pay attention to English writing such as Page 4, line 44 ‘e.g.’ and Page 4, line 52 ‘GP’.

Thank you very much for the legitimate note. Any discrepancies have been corrected now.

Reviewer 2:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There could be a section of discussion and/or conclusion.</th>
<th>This is not a requirement for protocol articles. The discussion section is optional for protocol articles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reason of the choice of the time frame from 2020 should be explained.</td>
<td>A time frame from 2000 – 2023 is used to cover all publications dealing with the identification of family carers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>