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16 January 2018

Dr Tovah Aronin
The Editor
BMC Geriatrics

Dear Dr Aronin

BGTC –D-17-00286R1

Potential cost savings to be made by slowing cognitive decline in mild Alzheimer’s disease dementia using a model derived from the UK GERAS observational study

Further to the additional editorial comments sent to me on 29th December, please see below our point-by-point response to each comment.
Once again, thank you for your time in reviewing our submission and look forward with interest to the journal’s final decision on our updated manuscript. All correspondence should be directed to me (the corresponding author) at the above address.

Yours sincerely

Alan Lenox-Smith FRCP FFPM
Corresponding author

Comment 1. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


This overlap mainly exists in your methods section (specifically pages 7,8 and 9)

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work.

Please rephrase these sections to minimise overlap.

Response: As this analysis is derived from the same study as the other GERAS publications, as expected there is much overlap in the methods section of this manuscript, particularly with the publication highlighted given we are submitting to the same journal. The methods have been rephrased where possible particularly for those related specifically to this analysis, please see pages 7-10.

Comment 2. Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Response: The email addresses for all authors have been added.

Comment 3. In your “ethical approval and consent to participate” section of your declarations please could you clarify how you determined which participants were cognitively intact enough to give their own consent and which participants needed a proxy to give consent on their behalf.

Response: Each site determined whether proxy consent was required for participants or whether they were able to provide their own consent.
Comment 4. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: As the funding body, Lilly employees were involved in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript as stated in the contributions section. This information has now been included in the Funding section as well (page 20).

Comment 5. We would also like to ask you to provide more justification for the contributions of ALS, CR, JL and RJ as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to the listed tasks alone, does not usually justify authorship.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have:

a) made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; AND

b) been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND

c) given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; AND

d) agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Anyone listed as an author must be included in this section. If you choose to change your author list you will need to fill out a change in authorship form and send it by email to the Editorial office to be approved by the Editor. The form can be found here: https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#authorship.

Anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet the criteria for authorship can be acknowledged in the ‘Acknowledgements’ section.

Response: the authorship contributions have been updated in accordance with the guidelines (page 20).