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Physical activity for people with dementia: A scoping study Alison Bowes, Alison Dawson, Ruth Jepson and Louise McCabe

My second review of this paper reinforces my previous perception that this paper makes an important contribution to the scientific literature by exploring the service providers’ perspectives on the challenges of providing physical activity programs especially in the community, what works and does not work, and examines data they use to evaluate their physical activity programs which differs from the scientific literature. Combining evidence from the literature, data from the survey and interviews enables a broader understanding and will facilitate practical know how in the development, implementation, and evaluation of future exercise programs. The outcomes addressed are also broadened to include those of particular relevance to persons with dementia and their family caregivers such as mental health, socialization and quality of life. In addition, Table 7 Key Conclusions of Included Studies makes a significant contribution to the literature.

Overall, the authors have adequately addressed my previous concerns. My comments fall within the Minor Essential Revisions category:

1. Page 6, 2nd paragraph, line 3: Spell out the acronyms (i.e., Report no 4, EPOC, and CASP) as the target audience may not be familiar with these.

2. Page 6, 3rd paragraph: Place abbreviations in brackets, not the full name.

3. Page 7, 1st paragraph, line 6: Change ‘clarified’ to ‘described’.

4. Table 1: numbers for Controlled Before and After design are not correct: n = 3; should ‘low’ read ‘one’, not ‘three’?

5. Table 8, the numbers for gender are reversed.

6. Page 13, 2nd paragraph, line 1: Spell out AHPs.

7. Page 14, 1st paragraph, line 8: 42% should be spelled out as it is at the beginning of the sentence.

I continue to believe that this research makes an important contribution, is based on three important sources of evidence, is timely, and worthy of publication.

Dorothy Forbes, PhD, RN Faculty of Nursing, University of Alberta, Canada
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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