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25 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 22nd January, 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)

As this overlap is with your own previously published article, we encourage you instead to include a brief summary of the methods and include a reference as to where interested parties can access the entirety of the methods used.

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. As requested in the previous comments (sent 29th December 2017) the methods have been rephrased where possible particularly for those related specifically to this analysis, please see pages 7-10. We are supplying a tracked version of our manuscript so the alterations are clear.

Comment 2.

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: Unfortunately we do not have this information as each site made their own decisions, as per the statement in the manuscript.

Comment 3.
The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship.

Please use initials to refer to each author's contribution in this section, for example: "FC analyzed and interpreted the patient data regarding the hematological disease and the transplant. RH performed the histological examination of the kidney, and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript."

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