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Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for reviewing this manuscript in such detail. Based on your detailed revision the following Major Compulsory Revisions have been made to improve the article.

INTRODUCTION

1. Should provide a brief background of aged care facilities in Australia and relate to problems in such facilities, so that the need for intervening IPP and Playgroups NSW are critical.

In the background section a brief background of demographic ageing in Australia identifying the percentage of people with dementia and the forward predictions associated with dementia in Australia in the year 2050. Additionally we have identified the number of residents with dementia presently in Australian Government subsidised aged care facilities. We have also outlined the purpose of Playgroup NSW sessions and made a clear statement bring together the aged care residents and playgroup participants (carers and children) for the IPP intervention in this study.

2. It seems like most of your subjects have cognitive impairment? Are you comparing effects of intervention between older adults with cognitive intact vs. impaired? Also your title doesn’t mention about dementia.

85% of the aged care participants experience varying degrees of cognitive impairment. We are not attempting to compare the effects of the intervention between older adults with cognitive intact v’s impaired. We are attempting to demonstrate that older people intact and people with dementia attend and enjoy the IPP intervention.

3. Should condense description or information of the intergenerational program in Introduction session, some of the information should move to methods session under “Intervention”.

The information on the intervention has been condensed and moved to the methods section under the title “Intervention”.

4. Need to explain non-adjacent and non-familial generation since it is confusing about who really involved in the intervention? Family and non-family members?

Non-adjacent generation – means “a twice removed generation” and non-familial generation – means “not an immediate family generation” These clarifications have been included in the text.
METHODS

5. Nine residents with severe dementia. Can they self-report data reliably?

The nine residents with severe dementia cannot self-report reliably. These residents were interviewed by the researchers with the assistance of the carer/therapist implementing the IPP intervention. The carer/therapist knew the resident very well and believed the resident should not be excluded from the study.

6. Please re-describe participants, it is confusing! From my understanding - Two groups in two phases each group in one phase? 48 from the first group participating in IPP? 41 from the playgroup, all from the same 3 facilities? Please clarify this. Or all participants participate in both phases?

The participants have been re-described on page 8 in this article.

7. Since MMSE was to identify levels of dementia, t is not your outcome measuring instrument, should describe it to avoid confusion.

The MMSE was used as a screening tool for aged care participants and is described under the heading - Screening of aged care residents and is included in the methods section.

8. The qualitative data were collected during the intervention period? When or what is the duration?

All qualitative data was collected during the intervention sessions. The interviews lasted between 15 and 30 minutes.

9. The authors mentioned that a basic grounded theory approach used for qualitative data collection but from the five questions, it is not easy to comprehend this approach.

We used “content analysis” not grounded theory.

RESULTS

10. A significant difference was identified on SF-36-energy-fatigue, which means what? Describe it.

The significant difference identified on the SF-36-energy-fatigue has been explained /described in results.

11. Why compare results between facilities? What is your purpose? Is it meaningful with small sample size?

As this study was conducted over three sites – we explored whether there was a possible site differences, however there were no significant site differences.

12. You only need to describe information listed in Table 1 and 3, no need to repeat these tables.
Table 1 has been deleted and the information has been described in the methods section under the heading “Participants” on page 8; Table 2 has been deleted and the information has been described in the methods section under the heading participants and Table 3 has been deleted and the information has been described in the methods section under the heading “Screening of aged care residents”

13. The first two themes seemed repeating.

The first two themes have been combined and renamed “Intergenerational experiences”

14. Poor discussion, I don’t see you provide rational as to why you got the quantitative results no improvement after intervention.

The discussion has been rewritten and a rationale for the quantitative results has been included.

15. Conclusion is not based on the results.

The conclusion has been rewritten and systematically linked to the results.

If additional information is required please advise me.
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