

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Dementia Friendly Prisons - a mixed methods evaluation of the application of dementia friendly community principles to two prisons in England
AUTHORS	Treacy, Samantha; Haggith, Anna; Wickramasinghe, Nuwan; Van Bortel, Tine

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Claudio Di Lorito University of Nottingham, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear authors</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to read such interesting work. The manuscript is well written and clear throughout. The findings are particularly relevant and although there are limitations related to sample size, you have clearly stated in the limitations section that this study is exploratory in nature. However, the manuscript needs revisions, before it is published, particularly in the Methods section, where procedures needs to be reported more clearly and the structure may need revising to attain better clarity. I have provided extensive comments, which can guide you in the revising process. You will find them in the PDF attached. Thank you.</p> <p>The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Shelley Peacock University of Saskatchewan Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	06-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This manuscript was a pleasure to read. Important work that draws attention to the need for dementia friendly environments in prisons in England and elsewhere for that matter. The writing is clear and the manuscript flows logically; figures and tables augment the writing very well to reveal the amount of work that went into this pilot study.</p> <p>I offer a few comments/suggestions to strengthen the manuscript: With the article summary information I would offer that including male prisons only is a limitation (granted, gender is named for future research on p. 29).</p> <p>I cannot tell when the abbreviation "PLWD" was started – does this mean persons or prisoners? I would actually respectfully suggest</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>not to use this abbreviation at all and instead refer to these persons in full.</p> <p>With participants is it possible to include some demographics to describe further who was in the study? Moreover, can reference to figure 2 be made earlier, perhaps on p. 7 where the participants are first discussed?</p> <p>A couple of times earlier in the manuscript I wondered why Prison B did not implement any dementia friendly strategies. Can this be addressed earlier in the paper rather than on p. 20?</p> <p>With the quote from a prisoner on the top of p. 17 I find it important to highlight/note that the increase in understanding of dementia was not limited to the prison setting, but also outward to this person's family.</p> <p>On p. 24, line 18 it is unclear who "they" are dying? At present, this sentence is awkwardly written and not clear.</p> <p>Perhaps the paper would benefit from a closing or conclusions section to tie together what the manuscript presented and what the key take home points are from this important work.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Sherryl Gaston University of South Australia Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for inviting me to review this article which is on a very important and ignored topic. I am pleased to see the terminology of Dementia Friendly used as I introduced it in Australia in the prison health environment and found people struggled to equate friendly with prison. I found the results interesting and would like to see further research in this area.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

- **REVIEWER: 1**

Reviewer Name: Claudio Di Lorito

Institution and Country: University of Nottingham, United Kingdom

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Dear authors

Thank you for the opportunity to read such interesting work. The manuscript is well written and clear throughout. The findings are particularly relevant and although there are limitations related to sample size, you have clearly stated in the limitations section that this study is exploratory in nature. However, the manuscript needs revisions, before it is published, particularly in the Methods section, where procedures needs to be reported more clearly and the structure may need revising to attain better clarity. I have provided extensive comments, which can guide you in the revising process. You will find them in the PDF attached. Thank you.

Response: Thank you for your comments, and the time and consideration you gave to our manuscript in making them. Please find our responses to your comments in the pdf below (the first page/line numbers are the places in the revised manuscript where changes have been made, and the second to the place in the original manuscript where the comment/sticky note was made).

P5 L5-7 (originally P5 L16)

Costs of what? Need to specify

Response: We have added to the sentence here as follows: “which has been associated with an approximately three-fold increase in the financial costs of accommodating them compared to the ‘general’ prisoner population.” (P5 L5-7).

P5 L24- P6 L1 (originally P5 L55)

Involvement in what? Need to specify

Response: We have added that a key principle of DFCs are the involvement of people with dementia “in the formation and development of communities” (P5 L24 – P6 L1).

P6 L7 (originally P6 L13)

This claim needs a reference to say the least. If no reference is available the authors should explain how they arrived at this claim: did they carry out a systematic search of the literature, including grey / white literature? How did they conclude that nowhere in the world does such evaluation exist?

Response: We have provided two references to a systematic review [31] on care interventions focused on ‘aged’ prisoners, and a systematic integrative review [32] that we conducted and which involved a systematic search of the literature. Both of these show a lack of relevant published evaluations.

P6 L8 (originally P6 L16)

I think the focus of the study is only on PLWDs

Response: We have deleted “older prisoners and” P6 L8. Have also removed two references and added one reference to reflect the change in focus to people living with dementia in prison more specifically.

P6 L13 (originally P6 L28)

Response: We have deleted “research project”, and inserted “study” as suggested.

P6 L14 (originally P6 L31)

Diverse in what sense? Do you mean to say “to two prisons”?

Response: The word ‘diverse’ was used here to highlight that the two prisons involved in the study were different types of prison or were prison types that were distinct from each other (see <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/diverse> and <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/diverse>). However, from this comment, it obviously isn’t scanning well when read, so we are happy to alter it to “two prisons” (P6 L14).

P6 L14 (originally P6 L31)

Response: We have changed “included” to “were” as suggested.

P6 L16-18 Research Question 1 (originally P6 L35)

Response: We have extended the first research question with: “following an intervention comprised of information sessions and meetings with the Alzheimer’s Society?”

P6 L19 Research Question 2 (originally P6 L38)

Response: We have changed from “implementation” to “the intervention”

P6 L20-21 Research Question 3 (originally P6 L40)

Response: We have added “of the intervention and DFC principles” to the end of the question

P7 L14-16 (originally P7 L26)

Need to briefly explain here how you did this. Focus groups? Individual interviews? Follow-ups?

Response: We have added a sentence here: “using questionnaires pre- and post-information session and at follow-up, and individual interviews and focus groups at follow-up” as a brief explanation of how the evaluation was completed.

P7 L20 - P8 L10 (originally P7 L34)

Need to specify which prisons, unless ethical requirements forbade disclosure

Response: We are opting not to identify the prisons due to both our ethical obligations regarding confidentiality and anonymity, particularly regarding the qualitative data, and because we do not think that it would add enough to the paper to justify any difficulties that might arise for either prison as a result.

P7 L20 (originally P7 L31)

Response: Deleted “Project” as suggested

P8 L3-4 and P8 L7-8 (originally P7 L46)

Would be interesting to know how many prisoners with dementia

Response: We have reported the numbers of prisoners diagnosed with dementia at each prison as reported to us by prison staff at Prison A (P8 L3-4) and healthcare staff at Prison B (P8 L7-8). We did not have access to prisoner healthcare records to verify these numbers, and did not collect data on the numbers of prisoners suspected by prisoners and staff of ‘having’ dementia – although this appeared to be higher than those who were formally diagnosed, as briefly discussed in the manuscript.

P8 L13 and L17 (originally P7 L54)

Please note that after full stop, you do not begin a sentence with numbers. Change throughout.

Response: We have changed this in these two sentences as suggested.

P8 L17 (originally P7 L56)

Need to say how many prisoners and how many staff

Response: We have moved Figure 2 from the Results section to the Participants section as recommended by another reviewer (P8 L16). Regarding this comment, as this Figure also shows the numbers of staff and prisoner participants at each stage, as well as participants from each prison, we think that we do not have to repeat all of the numbers in the text. Hopefully, moving the figure and some of the text from the Results section helps to clarify this section, and the numbers, as a whole.

P8 L17-18 (originally P7 L59)

This is unclear. The prison staff invited prisoners and staff (themselves?!?). Clarify please

Response: We have inserted some more detail to clarify: “the staff who were leading for the study within each prison, as selected by each prisons’ No 1 Governor.”. We had contact people who acted as leads within the prison for the study, and they were tasked with this by the No 1 Governors in each of the prisons. As part of this role, these members of staff were responsible for inviting prisoners and their staff colleagues to participate

P9 L13 (originally P8 L3)

Representatives of what? How many prisoners and how many staff exactly? Need to be specific about numbers

Response: These were representatives of the Alzheimer’s Society – workers within their organization who were allocated to the prisons for the purposes of the study – and we have added in a line here: “workers identified by AS to work with the prisons for this study” (P 9 L13). As mentioned above, we have repositioned Figure 2 at the top of this section (P8 L16), which contains specific numbers. Where the numbers are not contained in the Figure, we have been specific in the text.

P9 L1 (originally P8 L8)

this is all really muddled. Again, the prison staff seem to have invited to take part other staff?? Please clarify all.

Response: We added in a sentence to clarify this (P8 L17-18) as commented above. The prison staff leads, were involved in inviting prisoners and staff colleagues to participate across the study. The research team followed up information session attendees who had consented, and the prison staff leads and AS reps. The 'Participants' section has been re-jigged throughout to try and make it clearer, we hope it has.

P9 L7-9 (originally P8 L16)

why?

Response: It is not entirely clear why there no people with dementia living in the prisons involved in the evaluation. Prisoners were invited to participate in information sessions by prison staff leads, and we believe this included individuals with dementia, but the staff were not asked to keep detailed records of this process, as it would have been too onerous a task in the circumstances. So, we can't really know. We do know that at one-year follow-up in Prison A, when the research team discussed inviting additional prisoners for a focus group with lead staff, it was reported that there were no prisoners formally diagnosed with dementia at that time. We have made a note of that in the Discussion section (P25 L21 – P26 L1), and that the lack of involvement is a limitation (although one that is apparent in the community too) but have also added a sentence here just to say "The reasons for this are somewhat unclear, as the research team was not directly involved in recruiting prisoners" (P9 L8-9).

P7 L15-19 (originally P8 L22)

This is the first time in the paper that the word "follow-up and focus groups" appear. What stage of the study do they refer to? if it is part of the evaluation process, you need to mention these when you explain the stages (line 23, page 7).

Response: As suggested we have moved Figure 1 up to the Design section (P7 L19) so that hopefully this is a lot clearer, and added in a sentence about this to the brief description of stages in that section as well (see comment above).

P9 L15-19 (originally P8 L37)

Please give examples of peer supporter roles

Response: We have included some examples of peer supporter roles. There are various different peer supporter roles at each prison, so we split the roles into 'types'. We are aware that at prisons outside of the two involved in our study, the names for the roles vary as well, so this approach is also more likely to translate across different prisons we hope.

P10 L6 (originally P8 L60)

Response: Changed the bracket type as pointed out, from) to]

P10 L7-8 (originally P9 L3)

Please specify which kind of information where asked here

Response: We have listed the types of information asked in the socio-demographic questionnaire here. asked.

P10 L9-14 (originally P9 L6)

Does study-specific mean that this and the next questionnaire were developed or edited by the research team? if so, need to describe the process of development. Also, would be helpful to have the tools in full in Appendices

Response: Yes, the questionnaires were created by the research team. The information session evaluation questionnaire was also modified following piloting and feedback from prisoners during the PPI phase of the study. This has been briefly described for both questionnaires. We have included the questionnaires as Supplementary Files 1 & 2 as suggested.

P7 L18-19 (originally P9 L29)

I would place this section (and the very helpful figure 1) at the beginning of the methods section. It helps readers understand the project procedure and context, which, at present (as stated in my previous comments) is confusing and difficult to grasp

Response: Yes, we agree with you and have moved this Figure to the beginning of the Methods section (P7 L19). We hope that this makes the Methods section easier to follow overall, so thanks for this suggestion in particular.

P11 L14-21 (originally P10 L6)

Need more info on data analysis:

1. Who extracted data. Response: This information is provided on P11 L15-16.
2. Were proforma used for data extraction. Response: As no standardized questionnaires were used and no associated proforma, a dataset was created within SPSS with variables representing all of the questions on the questionnaires, and data were entered directly onto this. We briefly state that data were “entered onto a dataset” on P11 L16.
3. Did any independent raters check for single researcher bias in the process of data extraction? Response: Yes, this is described on P11 L16-18.
4. Who did data analysis? Response: Two researchers undertook the analysis (P11 L18-19).
5. Need to state at which value p was significant Response: The p-value is stated on P11 L21.

P11 L16 (originally P10 L10)

Need reference for SPSS

Response: We have provided a reference for SPSS – no 40.

P12 L2 (originally P10 L25)

Again, first time I hear about flipcharts without any previous explanation. What are these and why / how were they used in the context of the focus groups?

Response: We have re-edited the Methods section so that this is no longer the first mention of flipcharts (see P 11 L8-9). As stated there we used flip chart paper to record focus group discussion as it happened. We were unable to get permission to tape the sessions in time, mostly because the sessions ended up being arranged too quickly to do so, so this was our best alternative.

P12 L9-10 (originally P10 L41)

Need references for softwares

Response: We have provided references for NVivo[41], MS Word[42] and MS Excel[43] as suggested.

• REVIEWER: 2

Reviewer Name: Shelley Peacock

Institution and Country: University of Saskatchewan

Canada

Please state any competing interests or state ‘None declared’: None declared.

Please leave your comments for the authors below

This manuscript was a pleasure to read. Important work that draws attention to the need for dementia friendly environments in prisons in England and elsewhere for that matter. The writing is clear and the

manuscript flows logically; figures and tables augment the writing very well to reveal the amount of work that went into this pilot study.

I offer a few comments/suggestions to strengthen the manuscript:

Response: Thank you for your comments and your time. We agree with your points, and have amended the manuscript as detailed below in response. We think/hope it strengthens the paper.

With the article summary information I would offer that including male prisons only is a limitation (granted, gender is named for future research on p. 29).

Response: Yes, we agree that it is a limitation. As suggested we have included this within the article summary section, within the fourth point: "and conducting the study in male prisons only is a limitation" (P4 L12-13)

I cannot tell when the abbreviation "PLWD" was started – does this mean persons or prisoners? I would actually respectfully suggest not to use this abbreviation at all and instead refer to these persons in full.

Response: We did use an abbreviation to save space primarily, but we are more concerned that our use of it makes our work read as in any way disrespectful. So, we have removed the acronym across the manuscript as suggested.

With participants is it possible to include some demographics to describe further who was in the study?

Response: We had difficulties collecting the socio-demographic questionnaires at the information sessions due to sessions over-running at Prison A in particular, resulting in at least two-thirds of the data missing on every variable for Prison A (aside from age and gender). This also resulted in around half of the data for prisoners being missing as well. Ultimately we did not include further demographics in our manuscript because of the inherent difficulties involved in presenting and interpreting this data with any confidence. Instead, we presented the two variables that we had more complete data for (age and gender), and briefly reported the lack of socio-demographic data as a limitation in the Discussion (P26 L14-15). However, we have now also added a sentence into the Methods section to briefly explain the lack of data: "Due to sessions over-running, there were difficulties collecting the socio-demographic questionnaire at Prison A" (P11 L1-2). In addition, we have included the socio-demographic data as Supplementary file 3, so that it is available, and added in a sentence of explanation to the Results section "With regards to the other socio-demographic variables, there were a large number of missing data making these difficult to interpret, however they have been included as Supplementary File 3" (P 13 L1-3).

Moreover, can reference to figure 2 be made earlier, perhaps on p. 7 where the participants are first discussed?

Response: Yes, we agree with your suggestion and have now moved Figure 2, and some of the accompanying text, to (what is now) P8 (L16), which is the top of the Participants section in the Methods. We think this clarifies the section, and hope that it reads better.

A couple of times earlier in the manuscript I wondered why Prison B did not implement any dementia friendly strategies. Can this be addressed earlier in the paper rather than on p. 20?

Response: We have now included a sentence in the first section of Key Findings 'Progress' that briefly describes this: "The lack of continued engagement largely centred around there being lower numbers of older prisoners at this prison, with other issues prioritised as a result, and the belief that services for people with dementia at the prison were good enough already" (P 15 L7-10). We think this might be the earliest/best place to discuss this.

With the quote from a prisoner on the top of p. 17 I find it important to highlight/note that the increase in understanding of dementia was not limited to the prison setting, but also outward to this person's family.

Response: Yes, we also think this is important, and have re-worded the sentence preceding the prisoner quote: "There were also reports of participants finding the information personally comforting and useful in supporting colleagues, and also extending to their communities of friends and family outside of prison" (P 16 L17-19).

On p. 24, line 18 it is unclear who "they" are dying? At present, this sentence is awkwardly written and not clear.

Response: Yes, it should have been "prisoners" rather than "they", which we have changed (P 24 L5).

Perhaps the paper would benefit from a closing or conclusions section to tie together what the manuscript presented and what the key take home points are from this important work.

Response: We have added a Conclusions section which we hope ties everything together in a way that is helpful (please see P29 L6-18).

• REVIEWER: 3

Reviewer Name: Sherryl Gaston

Institution and Country: University of South Australia

Australia

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': none Declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you for inviting me to review this article which is on a very important and ignored topic. I am pleased to see the terminology of Dementia Friendly used as I introduced it in Australia in the prison health environment and found people struggled to equate friendly with prison. I found the results interesting and would like to see further research in this area.

Response: Thank you for reading our manuscript and for your comments.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Claudio Di Lorito University of Nottingham, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	20-May-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Dear authors Thank you for revising the manuscript following my comments. I hope they were helpful. I confirm that I am now happy with the quality of the paper and will recommend publication in its current state to the editor(s).
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Shelley Peacock University of Saskatchewan Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	20-May-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to review your revised manuscript. The abstract reads clearly and sets the stage for what is to follow
-------------------------	--

	<p>in the paper. The introduction does a good job of indicating the importance of the study.</p> <p>Thank you for attending to my earlier comments (e.g., not using an abbreviation for persons with dementia, including a conclusions section, etc.). You have done a lot of work to address the reviewers comments.</p> <p>I do think some further clarity is required however, for a few things. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please write out “PPI/E” the first time, and describe what it is on p. 7, line 5. 2. Furthermore, in stage (i) on p. 7 you indicate prisoners were not directly involved, only to state on p. 8 line 13 that 46 prisoners were involved. 3. P. 7, line 8 would benefit from “relayed” in place of “fed-back”. 4. P. 8 starts to describe the flow of participants and I find it rather convoluted. You indicate 50 prisoners in total, then go on to state “Forty-five prisoners and staff attended...”, then on p. 9 indicate “A further 24 prisoners participated...” It is difficult to conclude how the 50 prisoners participated and if it is the same prisoners (e.g., attending the information sessions and focus groups). As such the way you have described your process makes it difficult to follow the study. 5. On p. 10 consent forms are indicated, but there needs to be further detail about how ethical approval was sought. 6. P. 12 begins with the description of participants, yet it seems you combined the mean age of all participants (staff and prisoners), but then discuss the age difference between Prison A and B. Figure 2 presents the flow of participants, but it is not clear – with Prison A over the “n” of the prisoners and then Prison B over the “n” of staff almost appears as though those were the participants from the prison above. Can prison A and B not have their participants broken down by staff and prisoners? Did the same prisoners and staff participate at all stages? So, 46 prisoners started in stage (i), yet there were 50 prisoners overall; does this mean 4 other prisoners came in at a different stage? <p>My questions about the sample are important because research with people living in correctional settings is very difficult to conduct; you should be commended for gaining access to these people to give voice to their concerns about dementia.</p> <p>Good luck with your submission.</p>
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

REVIEWER: 1

Reviewer Name: Claudio Di Lorito

Institution and Country: University of Nottingham, United Kingdom Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below Dear authors

Thank you for revising the manuscript following my comments. I hope they were helpful. I confirm that

I am now happy with the quality of the paper and will recommend publication in its current state to the editor(s).

Thanks, and yes your comments were helpful. We have added a thank you to the reviewers in our acknowledgements section (P32 L17-8) in recognition of this.

REVIEWER: 2

Reviewer Name: Shelley Peacock

Institution and Country: University of Saskatchewan Canada Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': I have no conflicts to declare.

Please leave your comments for the authors below Thank you for the opportunity to review your revised manuscript. The abstract reads clearly and sets the stage for what is to follow in the paper. The introduction does a good job of indicating the importance of the study.

Thank you for attending to my earlier comments (e.g., not using an abbreviation for persons with dementia, including a conclusions section, etc.). You have done a lot of work to address the reviewers comments.

I do think some further clarity is required however, for a few things. For example:

1. Please write out "PPI/E" the first time, and describe what it is on p. 7, line 5.

We have written out PPI as Patient and Public Involvement on P7 L5-6, and have followed that with a very brief description of it there ("prisoner involvement in the research process was essentially preparatory"), and some further details of the types of involvement through the rest of the section (P7 L6-12). We have also provided a fuller definition and reference in the footnotes on P31 L6-9 (footnote 2: "Patient and Public Involvement has been described as "research being carried out 'with' or 'by' members of the public rather than 'to', 'about' or 'for' them" [71]. So, prisoner involvement in the research process itself, as distinct from being a 'participant' in research interventions or evaluations"). The journal asks authors in the Submission Guidelines to provide a PPI statement in the Methods section addressing certain questions, and this is our PPI statement.

2. Furthermore, in stage (i) on p. 7 you indicate prisoners were not directly involved, only to state on p. 8 line 13 that 46 prisoners were involved.

Yes, it is probably the way this is phrased that has made this problematic, and we have slightly modified the PPI statement on P7 L5-12 to try and clarify this (as above). What we are trying to say is that prisoners were involved in some aspects of research process (such as assisting in modifying evaluation materials) and not in others (such as recruiting or conducting the evaluation). So when we say that 46 prisoners were involved in PPI on what was P8 L13, we are referring to the prisoners who were involved as described on P7 L6-9.

3. P. 7, line 8 would benefit from "relayed" in place of "fed-back".

We have no particular issue with using either relayed or fed-back, so have changed it (P7 L9)

4. P. 8 starts to describe the flow of participants and I find it rather convoluted. You indicate 50 prisoners in total, then go on to state "Forty-five prisoners and staff attended...", then on p. 9 indicate "A further 24 prisoners participated..." It is difficult to conclude how the 50 prisoners participated and if it is the same prisoners (e.g., attending the information sessions and focus groups). As such the way you have described your process makes it difficult to follow the study.

We appreciate that this is difficult to follow. We have attempted to make this section clearer by describing the information sessions attendees, and their route through the study, in a separate paragraph (P8 L20 – P9 L7) from the people who participated in the follow-up evaluation only (without attending the information session) – P9 L9-16). Essentially, 50 prisoners participated in the intervention and evaluation, 37 of whom attended the information session and 13 of whom only took part in the follow-up evaluation.

In addition, we have moved the paragraph about numbers participating in the interviews and focus groups (the para that contains “A further 24 prisoners participated” originally p9) to the Procedures section P11 L3-15), so as not to confuse the numbers further. The people who participated at follow-up involved both information session attendees and non-attendees. From this overall follow-up sample, 17 were interviewed (11 staff and 6 prisoners) and the rest of the prisoners in this sample (the further 24) participated in focus groups.

5. On p. 10 consent forms are indicated, but there needs to be further detail about how ethical approval was sought.

On P11 L17-9 we have described the process a little further “Informed consent was sought from all participants prior to interviews or focus groups, with researchers going through information sheets and consent forms with potential participants, answering any questions that arose”.

6. P. 12 begins with the description of participants, yet it seems you combined the mean age of all participants (staff and prisoners), but then discuss the age difference between Prison A and B. Figure 2 presents the flow of participants, but it is not clear – with Prison A over the “n” of the prisoners and then Prison B over the “n” of staff almost appears as though those were the participants from the prison above. Can prison A and B not have their participants broken down by staff and prisoners?

We have altered Figure 2 to show prisoners and staff separately.

Did the same prisoners and staff participate at all stages?

It was a mixture. We have tried to clarify this in the Participants section in Methods as described above (P8 L20 – P9 L16), and have added a key to Figure 2 to try and make this clearer too: so those in the green boxes to the left of the figure are information session attendees, some of whom we were also able to follow-up for the evaluation; the blue boxes to the right are people who participated in the follow-up evaluation only and did not attend the information session; and the grey boxes show the total number of participants at each follow-up point (information session attendees and non-attendees combined).

So, 46 prisoners started in stage (i), yet there were 50 prisoners overall; does this mean 4 other prisoners came in at a different stage?

The figures in Figure 2 and in the Data Analysis section only pertain to the prisoners and staff who participated in the Intervention and Evaluation stages of the study (stages (ii) and (iii)). Whilst this is stated in the Methods section where Figure 2 is placed (P8 L17-8), we have decided to add this to the first sentence of the Results-Sample Characteristics section (P13 L1-2), and to the Figure 2 title for further clarity. We have also added in a sentence to the PPI statement (P7 L11-2) to state that no findings will be presented from this stage of the study.

My questions about the sample are important because research with people living in correctional settings is very difficult to conduct; you should be commended for gaining access to these people to give voice to their concerns about dementia.

Good luck with your submission.

Agreed, and thanks. We are happy to try to clarify these issues, as we do not want our work to be confusing for readers, so we thank you for the time you have taken to help us with this. As mentioned above we have also added in a thank you to reviewers in our acknowledgements section