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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Danan Gu,

Thank you for your comments in relation to our paper *Attitudes and preferences towards screening for dementia: a systematic review of the literature*. We found the suggested changes fair and useful for improving the quality of our paper. Please see our responses below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1). Lines 73-77: These sentences are against the screening, which is different from those in Lines 66-73. First, some transitional words should be provided. Second, the justification for against screen should be provided. It is not sufficient to merely note that the population screening do not meet the WHO screening criteria. It should be specified why it is important to meet the WHO criteria and which criteria.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment. Lines 63-73 and 73-77 have been changed for clarity. In the introduction we state that the review is to examine one specific aspect of the WHO criteria (the UKSC also use the same criteria), which is “The test should be acceptable to the population”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2). Related to the first point, UK Department of Health is for the population screen, yet UK National Screening Committee is against it. Why do these two agencies have different views on the topic? It would be great to provide some reasons behind their views.</td>
<td>The sentence has now been amended for clarity. We do not feel it is appropriate for the paper to speculate on why the DH has different perspective to UKSC so this sentence has been removed. We refer to specific screening policy only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3). Motivation should be strengthened in the background. Why attitude and preference are important in determining the acceptability of population screening for dementia?</td>
<td>Yes, we agree. The last part of the paragraph was amended (now lines 81-90) to address your comment and to describe why attitudes and preferences are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4). In Methods Section, a more detailed introduction about PRISMA should be provided explicitly in the text. And how is it applied to the present study should be provided as well.</td>
<td>The sentence has now been amended and reflects that PRISMA was used to ensure transparency in how we selected and analysed the literature. This is a classic statement. We also added Appendix 5, which describe the checklist but, in our opinion, this is not necessary because the tool is easily available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5). Lines 94-95: The authors noted &quot;no time or language limits&quot; strategy (and also abstract). This should be clearly</td>
<td>The sentence has been edited to reflect the suggested changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stated that such a search option is only applied to the databases listed in the paper. Other databases as not included. Indeed, I did not see any database specific to Arabic, Japanese or Chinese.

(6). Consider separating patient and public involvement in keywords. They are different keywords.

Patient and Public Involvement is an important and emerging initiative in the NIHR and wider UK health care context, we feel that maintaining PPI as a key word will be beneficial for those wishing to find and reference the paper.

We are pleased to resubmit the manuscript for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Steven Martin
Research Associate
Institute of Public Health, Forvie Site, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Box 113, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Cambridge CB2 0SR. UK.
sm987@medschl.cam.ac.uk
Telephone: 01223 330317
Fax: 01223 330330