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**Reviewer's report:**

Dear authors,

Thank you for resubmitting this manuscript and for addressing the suggested changes. The manuscript is much improved as a result.

Outstanding revisions:

1) The manuscript requires a thorough read through in order to check English and terms such as 'a depression' which remain incorrect.

2) You describe having reached 'data saturation' - please can you clarify what you mean by 'saturation' (e.g. no new categories emerged) and/or include a citation.

3) The presentation of findings remains light in terms of patient voice and findings still appear to be more like a commentary from the researcher's perspective - but this is due to the analysis style which cannot be altered. I would therefore suggest that you include a recommendation that further in-depth qualitative research is needed to explore depression among the oldest-old to build upon what this manuscript provides hints towards.

The additional note under Table 1 requires rewording. I would suggest 'Patients did not identify as having depression' rather than patients denied it.

Kind regards
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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