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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We have revised the manuscript entitled “Improving early detection initiatives: a qualitative study exploring perspectives of older people and professionals” to incorporate the editorial requests and the essential revisions recommended by the reviewers. Our responses to the points raised are listed below.

We hope to have addressed the comments satisfactorily and look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

The authors
Editor's comments

1. We notice you have provided several indirect identifiers along with the quotes provided in your manuscript. Although we understand that this information could be useful to readers, we are unable to publish this many individual details without consent to publish having been obtained from the participants. This is a different form of consent than informed consent to participate in the study and it refers specifically to publication of potentially identifying personal information and details and must be obtained in writing. If this form of consent was not obtained, please alter the participant information provided for each quote to ensure that participant anonymity is not compromised and please alter your "Consent for publication" section statement.

Authors' response: We understand your concern. In our information letter, as well as in the information we provided verbally, we explained the purpose of the study, as well as how their data would be used. This information explicitly stated that their anonymous data would be used for a scientific publication. After receiving this information, all participants signed a consent form, agreeing to 1) participation in the study, and 2) the use of their anonymous data for the goals as explained in the information letter. We revised our ‘Consent for publication’ section to reflect this, see L738-741.

Because we did not obtain written consent to publish potentially identifying information, we chose to alter participant information provided for each quote. However, we do think it is valuable to readers’ interpretation of the quotes to include some participant information, also to reflect the heterogeneity of the respondents. Our suggestion is to only include a participant number and the participant’s age group (rather than their actual age) in case of older participants. In addition, we added some sentences to the beginning of our results section, describing the selection of the quotes. We also removed some potentially identifying information from the interviewed professionals. We hope this will be acceptable for publication.

2. Please remove the rebuttal letter from the additional files, as this is no longer required and should not be published as supplementary material to the manuscript

Authors' response: Done

3. Please provide, after the References, a section titled “Additional files” where you list the following information about each of your supplementary files: * File name (e.g. Additional file 1), * Title of data, * Description of data. Please ensure also that all additional files have been cited in the main manuscript.

Authors' response: Done, see L938-944
4. Please submit your revised manuscript as a clean copy without tracked changes, as these are no longer required at this stage of the editorial process.

Authors' response: Done

Reviewer 3's comments

5. I have recommended discretionary revisions because I have noticed 3 minor errors with the written English:

Line 294 - 'indicated they felt be able to deal with' - delete 'be'

Line 483 - 'did indicate to expect some problems' - should be 'did indicate that they expected some problems', or (e.g.) 'did appear to expect some problems'

Line 544 - 'indicated to regard' - should be 'indicated that they regarded', or (e.g.) 'appeared to regard'

Authors' response: Thank you for your suggestions, we have edited our manuscript accordingly (see L265, L450 and L511)