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Author's response to reviews: see over
Response to Reviewers’ comments

We are very grateful for the Reviewers’ helpful and constructive comments and are pleased to respond as follows:

Referee 2

Major compulsory revisions:

We have added text to the Methods section describing in detail the age ascertainment process, which is also described in the cited Lancet paper describing dementia prevalence in this sample. We have also added text to clarify that sampling took place of all 65+ year olds in each site – there was no over-sampling of different age groups and the different age distributions, we assume, reflect different mortality patterns for older people between sites. We have also added text to the Results section describing the participation rates for each site.

Minor essential revisions:

We have endeavoured to correct typographical errors in the manuscript including punctuation errors.

1. We have amended as suggested.
2. We have amended as suggested.
3. We have amended as suggested. We have substituted ‘investigate’ for ‘decompose’. We have corrected CSI ‘D’ throughout the manuscript. We have double-checked and believe that WLM is correct where cited.
4. The sentence has been amended to ‘For this analysis we considered the following socio-demographic measures as independent variables’.
5. We have deleted NIA where mentioned. We have amended the sentence on sites to indicate the ‘aforementioned sites’ which we believe the cited paper refers to. The CSI ‘D’ was actually administered in the Jamaican sample cited in reference 13 along with the CERAD battery (because RS has analysed these data), although we agree that the reference given only refers to the CERAD battery. We do not believe the CSI ‘D’ data from Jamaica have been published to date (a paper is under review on this) and reference 13 remains the principal one for this study. We have therefore amended the wording to clarify what aspect of the Jamaican study reference 13 refers to.
6. We have added the following text to the Methods to clarify the distraction task: ‘Approximately five minutes later, after a series of unrelated CSI ‘D’ questions (name registration, object naming, object function, repetition) the participant is again asked to recall the 10 words with prompting that they were read from a green card, giving a WLR score out of 10’. We have made the other recommended amendments.
7. We have changed ‘decompose’ to ‘investigate’. We have made the other suggested amendment.
8. We have made the suggested changes.
9. We have removed the LAMIC abbreviation from the text.
10. We have made the suggested changes.
11. The suggested changes have been made.
Referee 3

We accept the comment that Tables 2-5 are lengthy. However, this is largely a result of the size of the data reported and we do not believe that the necessary normative data can be displayed with any further abbreviation. We also note that Referee 2 is in favour of the tables’ presentation.

1. We have made these text amendments.
2. We have added footnotes to Tables 1-5 clarifying the DR abbreviation and have expanded the footnote on missing values to clarify.
3. (addressed above)
4. We have removed the LAMIC abbreviation.

Referee 1

1. We have amended this footnote as described above.
2. We have clarified this abbreviation as described above.
3. We would be happy to follow editorial guidance on the structure of Tables 2-5 as there is some disagreement between Reviewers. We do not believe that it would be appropriate to summarise normative data in the text since a reader who wished to use this information would wish for a complete display of both norms and beta values. We believe that one decimal place is the most parsimonious way of displaying the information and have attempted to apply this consistently.
4. We have corrected this error.
5. We have re-worded this sentence to stress that the region differences referred to were in grouped averages rather than individual scores.
6. We have corrected this error.