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

Thank you for the comments in relation to our paper *Attitudes and preferences towards screening for dementia: a systematic review of the literature*. Please see our responses below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1). line 190-192, the authors provided justifications for the groupings that they used to organize the themes. However, it is a little bit weak. It would be great to strengthen the argument.</td>
<td>The sentence has been amended for clarity and the organisation of the themes explained in more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2). line 331-332. the quote is from the perspective of primary care settings. Even though it discussed the importance of the family to the patients, I think it would be better to be classified as the health care professionals' perspective.</td>
<td>The data is organised into two broad categories in relation to how it impacts on the attitudes, preferences and consequent behaviours of a specific group, i.e. patients/carers public OR clinicians/health professionals. It does not “simply” represent the perspectives of a group. All the themes were generated this way. Lines 190-193 in the data analysis section were amended to clarify this. So, the quote on lines 331-332 was selected to demonstrate how someone’s family influences this person’s attitudes, preferences and likelihood of wanting or accepting a screen for dementia. This theme, identified by professionals as being an important determinant of patient and carer’s attitudes/behaviours, came up several times. Thus, we do believe this theme belongs to the patients/carers section. Moving it would create inconsistencies across the whole manuscript because all the themes were identified according to their impact on attitudes/preferences/behaviours, not according to who said what. We hope this addresses the comment raised by the reviewer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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