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Dear Dr. Madamba, dear reviewers,

Thank you very much for the potential acceptance of our manuscript “What would you like to achieve?” Goal-Setting in Patients with Dementia in Geriatric Rehabilitation. Results of a Cohort Study" to BMC Geriatrics.

We carefully considered and responded to each of the comments provided by the editor and reviewer 1 point-by-point and modified the manuscript accordingly. We are very pleased that we fully met the requests of reviewer 2. Please find enclosed the revised and clean version of our manuscript.

We hope that the revised manuscript now meets the editors’ and reviewers’ requests and the high scientific standards of BMC Geriatrics. If there are any further comments, questions or requests, please don’t hesitate to contact me for clarification.

We thank you for the efforts and valuable comments which helped to improve the manuscript.
With kind regards, also on behalf of the other authors

Ilona Dutzi

Editor Comments

1. Thank you for providing information regarding consent from participants. However, we ask that you please include additional details of the consent process in your manuscript, including when consent was obtained from a patient’s legal representative.

Response: We followed the suggestion and specified the information of the consent process as follows:

“Positive screened persons and, if applicable, their legal guardians or authorized representatives were informed in verbal and written form about the study program and asked to give written consent before inclusion. The whole procedure was conducted in a comprehensible way according to the recommendations of Appelbaum (38).” (page 6, line 125-128)

“The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty at the University of Heidelberg in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. All patients or their legal guardians and authorized representatives signed the informed consent prior to their inclusion. Patients without any support who were not capable of making decisions during inpatient rehabilitation were excluded.” (page 22, line 473-477)

2. Please include the initials of Jürgen M Bauer in the Authors’ contributions section, along with their individual contributions.

Response: We included the initials and individual contributions of Jürgen M Bauer in the author’s section. (page 23, line 501)

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

Response: We removed this information as indicated (page 22, line 492-495)

4. 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 colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: We followed this instruction and uploaded a clean version of the revised manuscript. File name: “goal setting in PwD_final_clean version”

Reviewer report / reviewer 1

1. I want to thank the authors for a very good rebuttal. I have only one minor comment:

The IQR that is now given, is not given as a Range, which is the definition of Interquartile Range.
Please correct that.

Response: We thank reviewer 1 for the positive feedback and the efforts in reviewing our manuscript a second time. We followed the comment and revised the IQRs in table 2, 5 and 6 accordingly.