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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this paper again. It reads very well. Many congratulations on an excellent and valuable piece of work. Here are some minor comments:

Abstract:

Background - the last sentence is missing a full stop.

Main paper:

Background, line 89, sentence beginning with 'Evidence uncertainties' - this sentence needs more at the moment it doesn't read very well and is incomplete.

In the background this reference could be included to demonstrate that priority setting has been carried out in long term care settings, but is yet to include people with dementia-https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5386006/ this was a study carried out in UK care homes - but recruited care home staff only.

Method: page 7, line 160-163. I think this sentence would fit better in the 'data collection' section, and inserted before the sentence starting 'participants were asked to reflect on the following topics guided by the authors'. Describing that all participants were provided with this lecture prior to the taking part in focus groups is key context around how data was collected, and I think sits better in the data collection paragraph.

Results: page 10, line 215. I wonder if 'creating empowering teams where all voices are heard' is a better title for your overarching theme? At the moment the main overarching theme title feels a bit too wordy.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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