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Author’s response to reviews:


POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES

To: Tovah Honor Aronin
The Editor-in-Chief
BMC Geriatrics

Original paper title: “Dual-task training with progression from variable- to fixed-priority instructions versus dual-task training with variable-priority on gait speed in community-dwelling older adults: A protocol for a randomized controlled trial”

We would like to thank the Editor for the opportunity for resubmitting the manuscript in its second revised form. If we have not yet been clear enough in our answers and arguments in this response letter, as well as throughout the manuscript, we would like to have a new opportunity to better address your questions or comments. First, we bring back the Editor’s comments, and after we provide our answer. Thank you in advance.

With best regards,
Professor Francis Trombini-Souza

Editor's comments

1. The project title for this study does not match the title of this manuscript. Please clarify why this is.

Authors’ answer: We thank the Editor for giving us the opportunity to better clarify this issue. The initial version of this study submitted and approved by CNPq and the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Pernambuco (UPE), had a slightly different title than the current version of this paper.
sent to BMC Geriatrics. Considering the title provides an important means of trial identification and after several re-readings of the project, we chose to readjust the title of this protocol paper, according to the SPIRIT Statement. However, this change still reflects the real objective and design of the initial project. According to the SPIRIT Statement, a title must be a succinct description that conveys the topic (study population, interventions), and the basic study design - including the method of intervention allocation (e.g., parallel-group randomized trial; single-group trial). This will facilitate retrieval from literature or Internet searches and rapid judgment of relevance. Including the study objective or primary outcome in the title can also be helpful for the readers' understanding. For these recommendations, we decided to add in this new title what is the experimental intervention (dual-task training with progression from variable- to fixed-priority instructions) versus the control intervention (dual-task training with variable-priority) on only the outcome primary (gait speed) in community-dwelling older adults.

2. Please move information in the dissemination policy section of the manuscript to the Availability of data and materials section. Please remove the dissemination policy section of the declarations. Authors' answer: The amendments have been made as requested by the Editor. (Availability of data and materials section, line 8, page 16).

3. 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: http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship Authors' answer: The individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript have been specified in the Authors' Contributions section, according to the guidance and criteria for authorship. (Authors’ Contributions section, lines 4-10, page 17).

4. In the body of the manuscript, supplementary files are referred to, however, they are not attached. Please amend this by removing the references to the supplementary files, or attaching them. Authors’ answer: The references to the supplementary files have been removed. (Ethics approval, consent to participate and dissemination section, line 16-17, page 5; Ethics approval and consent to participate section, line 4-5, page 16).

5. In the methods section, please correct "clinicaltrial.gov" to "clinicaltrials.gov". Authors' answer: The change has been made as requested by the Editor. (Study design section, line 20, page 4).

6. Please put your responses to the reviewers'/editors’ comments in the Response to Reviewers box in Editorial Manager. Please do not upload a separate letter. 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. Additional files should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional-supplementary files are cited within the text. Authors' answer: All guidelines has been followed.
7. For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Authors' answer: As suggested in commentary # 2, we moved the information in the “dissemination policy” section of the manuscript to the “availability of data and materials section”. (Availability of data and materials section, line 8, page 16).