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Reviewer's report:

Interesting article but you are very coy about describing how the COGFAST study worked. You talk about paper and pen tests of memory function and then looking at their brains with a microscope after they died and had donated their brains for research by the brain bank. How does this process work ie how did they keep in touch with people so long and then persuade them to donate their brains? This is part of any lay research summary. I found having to download each of the formats was not easy and they were not clearly labeled with dates. Is going to be available in hard copy? as I prefer to print out what I read to digest it properly. I read that the research was old 1999 to 2003. You did not list separately the relevant journals articles from which the lay summaries were made. It would be nice to have that made clearer. You talk about the general public but your focus groups seem to be some people with lived experience as users or carers or people with an interest in research. I do not think you mean the general public in this context. You could have said more about dissemination of research findings and what the readership of the journals you chose was.
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