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Title: Strategies to support engagement and continuity of activity during mealtimes for families living with dementia; a qualitative study.

Response to Reviewers
Editor
The style requirements have been removed and the format of the paper adjusted to meet these requirements.

Reviewer: Ruth Palan Lopez
1. It appears that the authors have published several papers from the parent study. As written, it is not clear what is redundantly reported in this manuscript and what constitutes "new findings" reported here for the first time.

This has been clarified in the purpose statement. Lines 135-140, 200-201

2. Many of the citations are old. The paper would be strengthened by adding updated references

References older than 8 years were updated.
Some older references (e.g. 3,4,6,17,22,24,25 etc.) are classic and influential works and were thus not changed. Other methodological references (e.g. 7) or those that provided definitions (e.g. 18) that are older than 8 years were also not changed.

Reviewer: Sarah Barnes

Please note that line numbers have changed due to the addition of content requested by the first reviewer.

1. line 166-167 This sentence needs clarifying to state who took part in the individual interviews. Were the PWD and CPs interviewed individually after the initial dyadic interview? If so, why was this considered necessary?

This has been clarified and an explanation for individual interviews offered. Lines 170-175.

2. Line 289 ‘... run interference ...’ it is unclear what is meant by this term.

This is now clarified. Lines 299-301

3. Line 317-319 the sentence doesn’t make sense and needs revising.
This has been revised to make sense. Lines 327-328

4. The key findings could be restated concisely at the commencement of the discussion chapter.
Key findings are now restated at the beginning of the Discussion. Lines 575-587