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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your decision to accept our manuscript subject to minor revisions. We have made the stated revisions, and this letter contains a point-by-point response that states how we have addressed each point. Each point-by-point response is listed below:

Editor Comments:
1. Thank you for providing information regarding consent to participate. Please specify in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section of Declarations whether consent was written or verbal. If verbal, please state if the ethics committees approved this form of consent.

ACTION: At the bottom of page in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section we have offered further clarification at the beginning of section:

“All of the participants who were asked and agreed to take part in the study gave verbal and written consent.”

2. In the Competing interests section, if there are no other competing interests from the other authors, please include a statement reflecting this.

ACTION: On page 13 under the Competing interests section we have stated that “There are no competing interests from the other authors.”

3. Please include a statement in Authors’ contributions clearly indicating that all authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

ACTION: On page 13 under the Authors’ contributions section we have stated that “All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.”

4. Please remove the funding information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding section instead.

ACTION: As requested the following section has been moved from the Acknowledgements to the Funding section, and has replaced the previous text in the Funding section:

“The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) is gratefully acknowledged (Grant reference ES/L001772/1). Work programme 3 forms part of the ESRC/NIHR Neighbourhoods and Dementia mixed-methods research study (www.neighbourhoodsanddementia.org).”

I hope these revisions meet your requirements, and I look forward to further correspondence in relation to this manuscript.

Yours faithfully

Dr Siobhan Reilly