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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewer 2:

Below we reply to the two comments Reviewer 2 made in the second round of review (see below). All other changes Reviewer 2 recommended were grammatical errors within our "response to reviewers" file and therefore have no bearing on the manuscript itself. An altered manuscript has been uploaded with track changes.

Thank you and we very much look forward to seeing our paper in your journal.

Reviewer 2 comments and reply:

1. Reviewer 2 says (p. 2): this is in agreement with the statement by Dame Sally Davies 'experts by experience'. However, some people might be left with the idea that if dementia affects understanding (does it?) , what checks are made to ensure validity of the expression of the experiences?
Response to reviewer comment: We cite Davies below as per your initial suggestion. On the second point, this is not in line with our values and I think it further distinguishes ‘us’ from 'them'. We took their views at face value and there were no clinical signs that their memory or level of cognition were impaired during the workshop (we clearly state that below). This was confirmed by the presence of the Dementia NI facilitators (this was one of the reasons they were there).

2. Reviewer 2 says (p. 16): it is fundamental to research that there is interchange of ideas. If a thought is not backed by evidence - here about bed blocking, then the extant situation needs explaining. No-one is saying that PWDs are to blame or feel 'got at' he problem is one of society not providing the facilities to enable safe discharge from hospital.

Response to reviewer: While we would like to keep this quote because it is the opinion of co-researchers, and would be read as such, we have erased it to satisfy this issue.