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Author’s response to reviews:

Myrra Vernooij- Dassen (Reviewer 3):
The topic of the study is very relevant and the article is well written. However, the authors claim effectiveness of the intervention while no control group has been used. Thus the conclusion is not supported by the data.

Authors' Response:
Thank you for identifying this point. This study used a within-subject or repeated measures design, where the participants were not randomly assigned into control versus experimental groups. Instead, baseline data was gathered from the participants themselves. This baseline data was treated as the "control" and compared with the data collected 6 months post intervention.
The manuscript has been amended to clarify this.
Methods, Line 139, page 6.
Conclusion, Line 307-310, page 15.

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and for your helpful comments.

Sarah Goldberg (Reviewer 4):
This is a well written paper on the very important topic of the impact of the dementia care hospitals programme. It is very interesting. You have addressed the peer review comments appropriately. I just
have one more comment and picked up one typo:
i) Line 116 page 5 - could you include why the DCHP programme included screening at 50 for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders and 65 years old for others.
ii) Line 185 page 9 typo Clinical staff perceptions

Authors' Response:
The difference in ages for screening the study population was selected based on the consensus that ‘younger onset dementia’ refers to the onset of dementia in people under the age of 65 and under the age of 50 for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Therefore, screening was set for people over this age.
A reference has been added to the manuscript for clarification, and the identified ‘typo’ has been corrected.
Methods, Line 116, 118 page 5.

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and for your helpful comments.

Marie Boltz (Reviewer 5):
This is well-written manuscript reporting on a pragmatic trial that examined the implementation of an educational program focused on dementia care in the hospital setting. The case for the program and study are well made. Methods are appropriate. Results are clearly presented and discussion flows logically.
In this revision, the authors have responded adequately to the reviewers' recommendations. The only issue that I have is that the psychometrics of the staff satisfaction survey were not reported. I recommend reporting these or if not done, describing this as a limitation.

Authors' Response:
We have amended the text to include that we did not complete psychometrics on the survey and acknowledged this as a limitation of the study.
Limitations, Line 304-305, page 15.

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and for your helpful comments.

FORMATTING CHANGES:
1. Funding
Please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Authors' Response:
We have amended the manuscript as requested.
Funding, Line 343-344, page 16.
Acknowledgements, Line 357, page 17.

2. Authors Contribution
We note that not all of the authors (Anna Wong Shee) have been mentioned in the Author contributions section. The individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. We note that two authors have the same initials (MM).

Authors' Response:
We have amended the manuscript as requested.
Authors Contribution, Line 350, page 17.