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RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

We are very glad about the conditional acceptance by BMC Geriatrics, and have carefully revised the manuscript (BGTC-D-19-00037-R4). The major revisions made in the revised manuscript were listed as follows:

Comment 1. Ethical approval
In the “ethical approval and consent to participate” subsection of the Declarations, please clearly state that the named ethics committee approved the study. It is not sufficient to merely state that the study was in accordance with their standards, and instead it must be clarified that the study was submitted to the committee and received approval.
Response:
Thanks a lot for the suggestion. We have clarified that the study was submitted to the committee and received approval.
‘All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The ethics committee of Department of Psychology at Nanjing University reviewed and approved the study. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants included in the study.’

Comment 2. Consent for publication
In your ‘Consent for publication’ section of your declarations, please confirm whether all participants gave written consent for their personal or clinical details along with any identifying images to be published in this study. Alternatively, if you believe all identifying information has been appropriately anonymised (e.g. by grouping ages into age ranges) and there are no identifying images used within the manuscript, then consent to publish is not applicable to your manuscript - please write ‘Not Applicable’ in this section if this is the case.
Response:
Thank you very much. We have revised the statement in this section.
‘Not Applicable’

Comment 3. Authors’ contributions
Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript in its current state.
Response:
Thanks a lot. We have added the statement in this section.
‘All authors have read and approved the manuscript in its current state.’

Comment 4. Clean manuscript
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:
Thank you very much. Following the instruction, we have carefully prepared the manuscript for resubmission.

We wish to thank you again for all the insightful comments. We now feel the manuscript is sharper and much improved as a result. We trust that the revised manuscript is suitable for publication.