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14 February 2018

Dr Tovah Aronin
The Editor
BMC Geriatrics

Dear Dr Aronin

BGTC –D-17-00286R3

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

Thank you for your email dated 26 January 2018 informing us that there remained too much overlap with our previously published manuscript. We have made substantial revisions to the manuscript as described in the point-by-point responses below.
Please note that we have made changes only to the Methods section of the manuscript, which has now been significantly amended and edited to remove overlap with our previously published manuscript. We hope that this latest version of the manuscript will meet with your approval, allowing the publication of what we consider to be important new information relating to the costs of Alzheimer’s disease in the UK.

We would like to thank you again for your time in reviewing our submission and look forward 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.

Unfortunately, the level of overlap with https://bmcgeriatr.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12877-016-0371-6 is still at an unacceptable level.

While I appreciate the overlap is with your own previously published article, we cannot accept complete textual overlaps, as can be seen in your present manuscript. We instead suggest you provide a summary of the methods involved in the GERAS study, in order to lower the whole page overlap that can be seen on pages 6-9 of your manuscript.

Please note, this is the last time we will be able to request these revisions. If this overlap is not reduced within your next revised manuscript, we will have to close your file.

Response: As previously noted, this analysis is derived from the same study as the other GERAS publications. We have significantly amended and edited the initial sub-sections of the methods section (page 7, lines 71 to 89). We had thought that the inclusion of some of the details relating to the common methodology with our previous publication would be required given the request by Reviewer 2 during the first round of review for us to provide additional details regarding costing. However, following your recent advice, we have now shortened the areas of common methodology to avoid duplication with our previous publication. The methods section now focusses on the new analyses performed with common areas cross referenced to previous manuscripts as necessary.

Comment 2.
At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: We have uploaded the manuscript as a single, clean version, as requested.