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Response to reviewers – RIAE-D-19-000031R1

Thank you for your comments and support in developing this manuscript.

We have reviewed your comments and hopefully have addressed them within the manuscript. Please find details or out actions below with reference to which line they refer to in the amended manuscript complete with tracker changes.

Reviewer #1
• We have elaborated on further evidence into qualitative data analysis training for older people. Lines 80-84.

Reviewer #2
• This paper was submitted as a commentary and was not designed as a piece of primary research. We agree that the work has limited generalisability to the field as was a reflective account of a small piece of work within a PhD. This has been reiterated in the conclusion (lines 296-7) to aid clarity.
• We agree that further work is required to support PPI partners in qualitative data analysis and for researchers to effectively integrate PPI into programmes of research. We have added this into the manuscript (lines 302-305).
Further information was requested on the evaluation process. Clarification of the number of forms completed has been added (line 174) and a copy of the evaluation form has been uploaded for the appendix. This was not a primary piece of research and formal methods of evaluating pre and post course knowledge and skills were not used. This has been clarified in lines 135-136.

Thank you for highlighting the inconsistencies in terminology. PPI partners has now been used throughout the manuscript (lines: 28, 32, 35, 57, 63, 206, 237, 244, 285) and PPI involvement has been amended to just PPI (lines: 49, 79, 83, 86, 87, 119, 219, 222, 288).

Thank you for your comments on the use of reflection and reflexivity. As discussion with my co-authors and reviewing relevant theoretical literature, we have ensured that we consistently use reflection throughout the manuscript (lines: 159, 219, 248).

Discussion on how relates to other studies lines 285-287, 289-291.

Reviewer #3

As previously stated, this was not a primary piece of research and formal methods of evaluating pre and post course knowledge and skills were not used. This has been clarified in lines 135-136. We have amended the wording of line 133 to clarify that PPI partners involved in the work had no previous experience in qualitative data analysis.

“It is also not clear how coding was trained and what was the exact training content.” We believe that this was detailed in lines 145-151 but we have further elaborated in lines 153-155.

As this was a commentary piece and not designed, nor powered with the same methods as primary research, we agree that it has limited scientific value. Rather our purpose of writing this commentary paper was to share our reflections. We have clarified this in lines 297-298.