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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors have adequately addressed all of my comments, except one. In response to my comment that we would expect WTP for a tax increase to fund AD medication to increase with income, they write that

"Income was not statistically significant in the regression analysis, as shown in Table 2 (formerly Table 3). In the manuscript, we do not discuss variables that did not achieve statistical significance. To remain consistent with this approach, we have decided not to present a discussion of income."

I do not see any value in adhering to consistency when it implies that an important finding is not discussed – and the non-significance of income is an important finding. In fact, less discussion would seem necessary if income were significant in the regression in Table 2. All else equal, we strongly expect WTP to increase with income – do the authors have hypotheses why this expectation is not met?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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