Author’s response to reviews

Title: “I just keep thinking that I don’t want to rely on people.” A qualitative study of how people living with dementia achieve and maintain independence at home: Stakeholder perspectives.

Authors:

Penny Rapaport (p.rapaport@ucl.ac.uk)
Alexandra Burton (a.burton@ucl.ac.uk)
Monica Leverton (monica.leverton.17@ucl.ac.uk)
Ruminda Herat-Gunaratne (ruminda.hg@gmail.com)
Jules Beresford-Dent (J.Beresford-Dent@bradford.ac.uk)
Kathryn Lord (K.Lord1@bradford.ac.uk)
Murna Downs (M.Downs@bradford.ac.uk)
Sue Boex (sueboex@gmail.com)
Rossana Horsley (rossana.horsley@gmail.com)
Clarissa Giebel (Clarissa.Giebel@liverpool.ac.uk)
Claudia Cooper (Claudia.Cooper@ucl.ac.uk)

Version: 2 Date: 18 Dec 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

Thank you for this opportunity. We have addressed the suggested revisions in the attached clean version of the manuscript.

Assistant Editor Comments:

1. Corresponding Author Email

-- Please include the corresponding author email address on your title page.

We have added this.

2. Consent

-- Please clarify whether the participants suffering with Dementia were able to consent for themselves.
In the case this was not possible, please specify whether consent was obtained from a direct relative. If so, please also clarify whether this consent was approved by the ethics committee.

We have added the text: "All participants with dementia had capacity to consent to participate."

3. Authors Contributions

-- We notice that authors SB, RH, CG are missing from the authors' contributions section. 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: https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.biomedcentral.com%2Fsubmissions%2Feditorial-policies%23authorship&data=02%7C01%7C%7C4f4f103305b44c42fb3a08d77fc7d7ad%7C1faf88fea9984c5b93c9210a11d9a5e2%7C0%7C0%7C637118368604067245&data=r4yrJW5VFHtbd%2Fcmnmdn8pMVS9MtJ751a7EVDknA%3D&reserved=0

We have added: "SB, RH and CG further refined the thematic analysis in an iterative process".

4. Consent for Publication

-- We note that you have included a ‘Consent for publication’ section in the Declarations. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

We have amended this to "not applicable"

5. Funding

-- In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

We have added to our funding statement: "The funding bodies did not contribute to the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in writing the manuscript."

6. Response Letter

-- Thank you for providing a response to the reviewers. As this document is no longer required at this stage of the publication process, please remove it from your submission’s supplementary files.

We have removed this.

7. 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. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.
We have done this.

8. Cite

-- Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

We have checked this.

Yours sincerely

Dr Penny Rapaport
On behalf of the authors